DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 054 CG 014 450

AUTHOR Kent, Martha Whalen, Ed.
TITLE Competence Is for Everyone: Gender and the Conditions of Learning. Collected Readings.
INSTITUTION Vermont Univ., Burlington.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Women's Educational Equity Act Program.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 98p.
AVAILABLE FROM Education Development Center, 39 Chapel Street, Newton, MA 02160

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Advertising; Anthologies; *Bias; *Cultural Influences; Educational Environment; Mass Media; *Parent Influence; Secondary Education; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Socialization; Textbook Bias; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Gender Identity

ABSTRACT

This manual, part of the "Competence Is for Everyone" curriculum, helps students examine the process of making appraisals of people and how appraisals can limit learning and career opportunities when based on sex or race. The curriculum can be used by intermediate, secondary, and junior college teachers and students. This anthology, a collection of background readings for the curriculum, explores the socialization of females and males by parents and schools; the presentation of males and females in the media and in textbooks; the nature of sex differences; and the processes underlying the acquisition of gender roles. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

ED188054

COMPETENCE IS FOR EVERYONE

GENDER AND THE CONDITIONS OF LEARNING

Collected Readings

1976

Martha Whalen Kent

Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Whitla

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

014450

University of Vermont
Women's Educational Equity Act Program
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

Discrimination Prohibited: No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving federal assistance.

Produced by the University of Vermont under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the auspices of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education or the Department, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Distributed by Education Development Center,
55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160.

The editor is grateful to the following people and organizations for allowing her to reprint the articles and papers listed below.

Michael Lewis, "Culture and Gender Roles: There's No Unisex in the Nursery," reprinted from Psychology Today magazine. Copyright © 1972, Ziff-Davis Publishing Company.

Ruth E. Hartley, "Sex-role Pressures and the Socialization of the Male Child," reprinted from Psychological Reports (1959, vol. 5, pp. 457-468).

Betty Levy, "Sex-role Socialization in Schools."

Robert Rosenthal, "The Pygmalion Effect Lives," reprinted from Psychology Today magazine. Copyright © 1973, Ziff-Davis Publishing Company.

Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard, "Cinderella Doesn't Live Here Anymore," from Manpower (November 1975, vol. 7, no. 11).

Barbara Cook, "Roles, Labels, Stereotypes: A Counselor's Challenge," reprinted by permission of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, and of the author.

Alice E. Courtney and Sarah Wernick Lockeretz, "A Woman's Place: An Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements," reprinted from Journal of Marketing Research (February 1971, vol. VIII, pp. 92-95), published by the American Marketing Association.

Ann Pincus, "Shape Up, Bionic Woman!" Copyright © 1976 by Newsweek, Inc. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission.

Sandra Bem and Daryl Bem, "Homogenizing the American Woman: The Power of an Unconscious Ideology."

MAY 1 1980

CONTENTS

Gender and Achievement-related Functioning: A Review 1
Martha Whalen Kent

Culture and Gender Roles: There's No Unisex in the Nursery 22
Michael Lewis

Sex-role Pressures and the Socialization of the Male Child 27
Ruth E. Hartley

Sex-role Socialization in Schools 41
Betty Levy

The Pygmalion Effect Lives 46
Robert Rosenthal

Cinderella Doesn't Live Here Anymore 55
Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

Roles, Labels, Stereotypes: A Counselor's Challenge 59
Barbara Cook

A Woman's Place: An Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements 66
Alice E. Courtney and Sarah Wernick Lockeretz

Shape Up, Bionic Woman! 72
Ann Pincus

Homogenizing the American Woman: The Power of an Unconscious Ideology 75
Sandra Bem and Daryl Bem

GENDER AND ACHIEVEMENT-RELATED FUNCTIONING: A REVIEW

Martha Whalen Kent

Constraints on the learning and achievement of women extend beyond legal barriers and overt institutional discrimination to informal hidden interpersonal acts that limit learning and performance. This informal process of role maintenance is largely not amenable to legislative change, yet it is at the heart of unequal learning and work experiences. Instead of promoting learning, and the full expression of abilities, this process informs members of each gender their role in society and defines the limits of their lives.

The nature of men and women and the processes underlying the acquisition of gender roles have preoccupied psychologists for some time. In surveying this body of research, a picture is beginning to emerge in the convergence of findings that characterize each gender. Several directions in psychological research indicate that the male role is characterized by an emphasis on achievement values, competence and self-direction. The female role is characterized by an emphasis on social acceptability, compliance, emotionality, while achievement-related variables are less prominent. It will be the purpose of this paper to review the sex-difference research with respect to achievement-related functioning and to explore the process of evaluative appraisal as a socializing mechanism.

Although conceptually and methodologically diverse, research on sex differences in achievement-related areas can be summarized as treating intrapersonal and interpersonal processes in attitude formation, cognition, motivation, emotional adjustment and behavioral differences. The following review will treat in brief detail representative topics in these areas.

In surveying the research, a convergence of findings emerges that indicates an emphasis on achievement or competence, and a skill orientation for males, be this in areas as disparate as the cultural constructs contained in stereotyping, as behaviorally specific as performance appraisal, as general as achievement motivation, or as particular as performance expectancy. Whether the setting has been the home, the laboratory or the school, or whether the process has dealt with largely intrapsychic functions or interpersonal relations, competence, ability and achievement are associated with the male role. A different constellation of qualities emerges for females, which consists of emotionality, lack of control, fearfulness, and lower achievement values. These emphases will appear fairly consistently in the areas summarized below.

Achievement Related Sex Differences: Intrapersonal Processes

Sex Role Attitudes. Attitude research has found that competence, and the esteem and well being associated with it, is ascribed to males rather than to females by both sexes. The recent work of Broverman et al. (1970) demonstrates a remarkable consensus in the characteristics assigned to men and women by groups differing in age, sex, religion, marital status and educational level. The valued stereotypes ascribed to males form a cluster of related traits which entail competence, rationality and assertion, while those ascribed to females reflect warmth and expressiveness. That is, women are perceived as relatively less competent, less objective and less logical than men; men are perceived as lacking interpersonal sensitivity, warmth and expressiveness in comparison to women. Not only are individuals consistent in the use of these traits, they also value the two sets of attributes differentially by judging male-valued characteristics as more desirable than female ones.

This differential evaluation extends even to such groups as mental health professionals. When clinicians were asked to characterize a healthy adjusted adult, a healthy man and a healthy woman, the ratings of the healthy adult and the healthy man did not differ from each other. Well-adjusted adults and men were described as competent, independent, and objective. Healthy women were seen as embodying the "less healthy" characteristics of emotionality and submissiveness. Both sexes also incorporate the appropriate stereotypes into their self-concepts (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957). Although women's self-concepts were less feminine than their stereotypic perception of women, and the self-concepts of men were less masculine than their perception of the "average" man, the self-concepts of women were significantly more negative than were those of men and incorporated more negative aspects of femininity such as incompetence, irrationality, passivity, etc. Although general measures of self-esteem appear not to indicate any sex differences (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), negative stereotypes are internalized to a greater extent by women.

The work of Broverman and earlier investigators (MacBrayer, 1960; McKee and Sherriffs, 1957) demonstrates that women and men are not only perceived differently but that these characteristics are separate and unequal; greater desirability and health are associated with the male characteristics of competence and rationality.

Performance Appraisal. The pervasive sex-role stereotypes find expression in attitudes toward women's work and performance. Women's work is downgraded in comparison to men's work by both men and women. Not only do men undervalue the accomplishments of women (Klein, 1950; Scheinfeld, 1944), women do so as well. To study sex-linked bias in the areas of intellectual and professional competence, Goldberg (1968) asked college women to evaluate journal articles, representing a number of academic areas, for which the sex of the author was systematically varied. Articles authored by a man were rated more favorably than the same articles authored by a female. Women's work was devalued for no other reason than the female name associated with it. Pheterson et al. (1971) obtained similar results when no statement of the quality of the work was associated with the work to be judged. When the work was associated with recognized excellence (in this case a painting was declared as the contest winner), the woman's and man's paintings were judged equally favorably. However, the woman's painting introduced simply as an entry in a local art competition was judged less favorably than the identical painting by a male artist. Thus, one necessary condition for equal appraisal appears to be the recognition by an authority of the performance in question. Deaux and Taynor (1973) have found that the performance of women is more highly rewarded than that of men, when the woman is seen as handicapped by her sex in a situation calling for emergency action. These studies demonstrate that it is possible for women's work to be judged equitably. However, the conditions under which this occurs are quite stringent. The excellence of the performance has to be absolutely clear and dramatic.

Performance Expectancies and Attribution Processes. The negative evaluation of women's work has its parallel in the self-evaluation and expectations women hold for their own performance. Women show consistently lower achievement expectancies, underestimate their performance (Crandall, 1969), show less satisfaction and pride in it (Leventhal & Lane, 1970), and hold more negative attitudes toward problem solving (Carey, 1958) than do men. The general procedures in the study of performance expectancies is to describe a task to subjects and ask them to estimate how well they expect to do in it. In nearly all instances in which these procedures have been used, men indicate higher expectancies than do women, even though the tasks employed have varied greatly. Thus, men have shown higher expectancies in solving anagrams (Feather, 1969); they expect to do better on tests of verbal intelligence and arithmetic abilities (Brim et al.,1969) and anticipate higher grade point averages in college than do women (Crandall, 1969). Boys predict greater success for themselves in marble-dropping games than do girls (Montanelli and Hill, 1969).

The consistency of these findings is impressive, covers a wide range of ages and tasks, and suggests that men are more confident of their performance than women. While the sexes are less than accurate in their estimates, Crandall (1969) finds that men's overestimates are substantially greater than women's underestimates. Although women may be more accurate in assessing their lack of ability, this honesty is not conducive to future performance. In Crandall's extensive series of studies, performance estimates consistently predicted performance outcomes.

Yet the puzzling aspect of these findings is that in the majority of tasks used, the actual performance of men and women is quite similar. Recent attempts at clarifying these results have researched cognitive attribution processes, in particular the nature of the explanations offered for the performance by men and women. A number of studies have found that men attribute their performance to ability when they succeed, while failures are attributed to external circumstances. For women, these patterns are nearly reversed. Women attribute success to luck and effort rather than to their own ability and skill. Deaux and Emswiller (1974) found that when using identical tasks and varying sex of performer only, subjects saw the performance of the male as due to skill and viewed the woman's performance as an outcome of luck. Men and women also differ in explaining their own performance (Deaux & Farris, 1974). Men who do well attribute their success to ability, while women attribute their success to luck. However, women attribute failure to a lack of ability. Men rarely use this explanation. They tend to attribute failure to bad luck. Other studies show women using luck not only to explain success but failure as well (Bar-Tal & Frieze, 1973) and to prefer games of chance to games requiring skill (Deaux et al., 1975). Men prefer games of skill and feel they are more successful in skill games than games of chance. The sexes do not differ in their estimates of success in games of chance.

Thus, in the explanations used by female subjects,women show a reluctance to take full credit for success. At the same time, they are more willing than men to accept responsibility for failure. These self-evaluations show consistent patterns of self-enhancement by men and self-deprecation by women in performance estimates and in casual explanations of success and failure. While this work has illuminated the subtlety and complexity of attribution process, it does not offer any reasons for the obtained sex differences. One might be tempted to conclude that women underestimate their performance because they attribute success to luck. But this explanation itself needs explaining. Why should women attribute success to luck rather than ability? A mere demonstration of sex differences does not constitute an explanation for why the sexes differ; it merely illustrates the manner in which they do differ.

Locus of Control. Other research approaches have looked to motivation in an attempt to explain some of the sex differences. Work on internal-external locus of control, although often inconclusive, has found that by early adulthood women feel less in control of their own fate (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Several questionnaire instruments have been developed to measure an individual's expectation that his or her own behavior is or is not responsible for an outcome event. Women see the events affecting them as the result of chance and luck rather than as the result of their own actions, a finding which is consistent with the attribution results discussed above. College-age men, on the other hand, see their behavior as internally caused (Feather, 1969). Indeed, a greater sense of personal strength and potency emerges for males during childhood and increases with age (Long et al., 1969; Benton et al., 1969). When asked to assess their own strength, dominance or power, boys and men clearly rate themselves higher on these dimensions than do women and girls. Omark et al. (1973) used peer ratings to determine a "toughness" hierarchy in a large number of classrooms in several societies. They found that boys overestimate their own position in this hierarchy more frequently than do girls. Feelings of increased dominance and power parallel the locus of control findings.

Achievement Motivation. Perhaps the most prominent emphasis in the study of sex differences in motivation has grown out of work on achievement motivation. McClelland (1953), an early pioneer, conceptualized the need for achievement as a desire to excell and achieve success in comparison with some standard of excellence. To measure the strength of this motive a projective procedure was used in which subjects told stories to a set of pictures. These were scored for acheivement themes. It was thought that achievement motivation could be aroused through instructional sets appealing to a standard of excellence. This was born out for male subjects who showed an increase in achievement imagery. Women, however, showed no consistent increase under arousal conditions.

These early findings have generally been interpreted as demonstrating less achievement motivation in women, since women did not respond to achievement arousal conditions. Alternate hypotheses to explain women's achievement motivation were proposed and tested. Field (in McClelland et al., 1953) thought that since women are more socially oriented, arousal conditions which appealed to social acceptance should increase their achievement motivation. He found that in response to this arousal condition men's need for achievement scores increased somewhat but women's scores increased significantly. One approach to the sex differences in achievement motivation has proposed that men and women are motivated by different needs. Men are motivated by achievement needs while women show a greater need for affiliation. Men strive to achieve a standard of excellence while women strive for social approval. Some findings indicate that women score higher than men on desire for affiliation (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). However, in examining other results, no consistent patterns emerge. There is, for example, no clear evidence for the claim that social reinforcement is more effective for women than for men.

A second research direction holds that women and men are similar in their need for achievement but differ in the kinds of goals for which achievement striving occurs. Women are thought to be more concerned with social skills and interpersonal success. Intellectual and academic tasks play a less important role. In this case social success is an important and legitimate achievement area and is different from the need for social approval. This is the conclusion that Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) reach in their review of the achievement literature. They are the first to correct the rather long-standing misinterpretation of sex difference results on the need for achievement. It is not that women show a consistently lower need for achievement than men do, but that females show higher achievement imagery regardless of arousal conditions. Men show a high level only when aroused through reference to achievement standards. Maccoby and Jacklin summarize the findings by proposing a male cluster of conceptually related results, such as self-confidence in undertaking tasks, higher internal locus of control and potency. The female cluster of related results consists of findings in which women consider themselves socially more competent, less shy, more attractive or acceptable to others than do men. A number of studies has found that women rate themselves higher on social and interpersonal skills (Katz & Zigler, 1967; Carlson, 1965). They also indicate more social interests than their male counterparts (Walberg, 1969). Thus, although women may not necessarily achieve to please, they may achieve for social competencies.

What if it is necessary to achieve both for social goals and academic goals? This is precisely the question Horner (1969, 1970) raises in her work on the "motive to avoid success." Horner argues that the traditional measures of achievement motivation do not reflect the conflict situation that particularly affects women who feel that doing well academically is expected but simultaneously believe that surpassing men is unfeminine. She asked subjects to write stories of highly successful members of their own sex. These were scored for the aversive consequences experienced by the successful protagonist. She found that 65% of college women described unpleasant events and attributes associated with the successful woman, whereas only 10% of college men gave such descriptions of successful men. Instead of heightened achievement imagery, the themes expressed fear of success and demonstrated an internal motive to avoid success. Recent work has attempted to clarify the extent to which stereotypes are operating as opposed to intrapsychic motives. Monahan et al. (1974) administered male and female stimuli to both male and female subjects and found that for both sexes negative consequences were experienced by the successful females. Stereotypes, or a shared belief about aversive consequences for successful women, appear to explain the fear of success results.

Yet the distinction between fear of success as a stereotype or as an internal motive is not clear. Makosky (1972) has demonstrated a link between fear of success and subsequent behavior. Women who scored low on fear of success performed best when competing against men or when the task was labelled as masculine. Her results also show that women who score high on fear of success are not afraid of competing in every situation. These women performed better when competing against other women when the task was labelled feminine.

Fear of success thus appears to be a function of lack of congruence in the acceptability of performance by oneself and by others. It will be recalled that Horner saw fear of success as a need resulting from the inconsistent demands placed on women. In all probability, fear of success is both a cultural stereotype and a response tendency, with both reflecting the contradictory demands placed on women.

Emotion and Behavior Differences Related to Performance. The relationship between performance and emotional functioning *per se* has most frequently examined the effects of anxiety on performance and has consistently demonstrated higher anxiety ratings for women (Mendelsohn & Griswold, 1967) and a negative relationship between anxiety and learning (Hill & Sarason, 1966). Maccoby (1966) finds that anxiety has a substantially negative influence on measures of aptitude or achievement for girls and women. Furthermore, failure is found to result in greater disorganization for women. Women also experience greater evaluation apprehension than do men. Females are more likely to take in negative feedback about their own performance (Eagly & Whitehead, 1971) and are less likely to engage in boasting or in making statements of pride (Whiting & Pope, 1974).

Some critical behavioral variables which limit learning for women are the greater compliance of females, with girls showing greater compliance to directives from parents (Minton et al., 1971) and teachers (Serbin et al., 1973). Females exhibit less exploratory behavior on some measures and at some age levels (Hutt, 1970). Whiting and Pope (1974) note that girls in several societies showed a lower frequency of self-initiated acts. They attribute this to the fact that girls are more frequently interrupted in their activities by the demands of others.

Achievement Related Sex Differences: Interpersonal Processes

Sex Role Attitudes. The individual differences reviewed above have their counterparts in the social context of significant adults and peers. Adults, parents and peers hold stereotypic conceptions of competence which are found as early as day one of an infant's life (Rubin et al. 1974) and increase with maturation. Parents describe boys as more likely to defy punishment, defend themselves, be competitive and enjoy mechanical things (Lambert et al., 1971). Girls are described as being more helpful around the house, neat and clean, quiet and reserved, sensitive to the feelings of others and as easily upset and frightened. A similar characterization is given by schoolteachers (Levitin & Chananie, 1972).

Social Maintenance of Sex Roles. Not only does the social context reflect male and female stereotypes, it reinforces them by discouraging deviations from sex-role norms. Spence et al. (1972) conducted a set of studies in which people were asked to evaluate both male and female job applicants who were acting consistently or inconsistently with sex-role stereotypes. Academic competence and masculine and feminine interests of applicants were systematically varied. Results indicated that, when allowed to process this information, conservative women and liberal and conservative men favored the women applicant who was competent in a feminine sphere. Only liberal women judged favorably women applicants who pursued more masculine interests.

In another study on the perception of sex-role deviation, Maracek (1974) found that subjects, when judging seriousness of psychiatric problems, indicated more serious problems for men who expressed dependency in comparison to women who expressed the same degree of dependency. Similarly, women who expressed aggression were seen as more disturbed than were men expressing similar levels of aggression.

Neither sex is free to act in a manner that contradicts the cultural expectations of proper sex-role behavior. The rewards and the sanctions for the proper enactment of sex roles with regard to achievement assure this differentiation. Moreover, this differentiation is less than equal. Parents and society value male children more highly (Pohlman, 1969), take greater pride in the achievements of males, hold higher academic and professional expectations (Hatfield et al., 1967; Sears et al., 1957; Hilton & Gerglund, 1971) and lend greater financial support for their education and training (Epstein, 1970).

Parental Socialization. The extensive work on parental socialization has attempted to characterize parental control and its relation to the child's behavior in an attempt to identify antecedents of childhood development. In general, the findings indicate that parents report using harsher punitive sanctions for sons than daughters and more warmth and nurturance for their daughters (Sears et al., 1957, 1965). Parents also report being more protective of their daughters (Sears et al., 1957, 1965), are reluctant to punish them and are less demanding in problem-solving situations than they are for their sons (Block, 1972). In addition to using more negative sanctions, parents are more restrictive with their sons (Maccoby, 1972) and more firm in the enforcement of parental demands (Baumrind, 1971).

The sex differences in socialization techniques experienced by boys and girls are less interesting in themselves. Particularly illuminating, however, are the relations these form with achievement and competence within each sex. The results of a number of investigators suggest that both parental warmth and parental demands are associated with achievement in boys, while for girls expressions of parental distance are positively correlated with achievement variables, with parental acceptance negatively correlated or not correlated at all. Baumrind (1967) finds that parental practices that are intellectually stimulating, demanding of maturity and firm are associated with competence. These techniques foster self-reliance through demands of self-control, high performance and independent action, and facilitate responsible, independent behavior for both boys and girls. These effective parents are "consistent, loving and demanding."

However, with regard to sex differences, warmth was related to autonomous behavior for boys but negatively related to autonomy for girls. Parental punitiveness was associated with undesirable behavior for boys and with independent and domineering behavior in girls. Consistent discipline was associated with independent and assertive behavior for boys and with affiliation in girls.

These relationships between maternal warmth and achievement behaviors for boys have recurred in a number of other studies (Bardick, 1971; Crandall et al., 1960, 1964). For girls maternal nurturance is related to dependency and less autonomous behavior, while nurturance is related to successful achievement and academic competence for boys (Crandall et al). Mothers who are slightly rejecting had daughters who achieved more. Thus, the greater nurturance that female children experience is not particularly conducive to achievement, but it does appear to facilitate appropriate "feminine" behavior. Parental enforcement in the form of earlier demands is associated with competence in boys. Mothers who prompted early self-reliance and independence had sons who scored higher on achievement motivation. Children whose mothers fostered emotional dependence showed lower need for achievement (Crandall, 1960). Finally, Baumrind (1967) finds that the combination of high maturity demands and nurturance is related to self-reliance, independence and assertion while nurturance without maturity demands is associated with immaturity and avoidance in both sexes. The pattern of these results suggests that parental socialization is to a greater extent associated with achievement behavior in boys and with more characteristically feminine behavior in girls.

What can be concluded from this catalog of achievement-related sex differences? A unified theory which integrates these disparate findings does not exist. The results suggest that people use gender to organize human activities and regulate their expression in a gender-related fashion. Acts and verbal constructs representing acts are associated with one sex or the other. Thus, the constructs of competence and emotionality represent different domains of acts and are ascribed to males and females respectively. The manner in which this occurs includes processes which legitimate activities as appropriate for one sex rather than the other. Competence is associated with men in the stereotypic traits discussed earlier. It is expected of men, as the higher performance expectancies suggest, and it is directly ascribed to them in the attribution of performance to ability. Conversely, competence is not present in feminine stereotypes. It is not expected of women, as the lower performance expectancies reflect, and when it does occur, it is not ascribed to the female performer but to external circumstances. It is dissociated from any capability women may possess. Not only do men and women hold this of other men and women, but of themselves as well.

Achievement-Related Sex Differences in School Settings. To the extent that education transmits the values and expectations of a society, the sex differences discussed in the previous section should be reflected in school settings. Although educators may disagree on the desirability of the socializing function of schools (Reimer, 1970; Illich, 1971; Holt, 1964), most are in accord that such socialization occurs or that it is, at least, one result of education. Moreover, since the explicit purpose of education is to teach knowledge and skills and, since gender is used to organize competencies, differential education and learning for boys and girls should be especially evident in this setting.

Teachers' Sex-Role Attitudes. Results demonstrate fairly consistent attitudinal and behavioral sex differences in teacher and student responses. The stereotypic competence and social-emotional cluster found in the work of Broverman et al. (1970) was also obtained by Aderer (1972) in his work with teachers. Seventy-five percent of the teachers described adolescent males as masculine, dominant, independent, assertive and as less emotional, ready to cry, or concerned about appearance than adolescent females. Female students were described as more feminine, submissive, unassertive and emotionally sensitive. The items indicated for males were also considered more desirable socially.

In a study of teacher's perception of the ideal male and ideal female student Gaite (1972) found the cultural stereotypes reflected in teacher expectations. Short descriptions of male or female students were presented to teachers. They were then asked to imagine the students' future lives. Their responses indicated a wider range of expectations for male students and a narrow range for female students, which covered mainly child rearing and homemaking.

The findings that out-of-role behavior is viewed more negatively and rejecting are also supported in studies with teachers and school children. The procedures consisted of presenting hypothetical instances to teachers and asking them to rate these and to describe their feelings. In the study cited above Aderer presented descriptions of four students to teachers. They were asked to indicate how the students would act and what they as teachers would do in encouraging or discouraging student action. Teachers indicated firmer treatment for a withdrawn boy than for a withdrawn girl. When asked to describe a "model student" the female "model student" was seen as intelligent but compensating for some deficit. Warmth and helping were associated with social skills and vocational interests in girls. For boys these qualities were associated with academic interests. Teachers also reported greater encouragement for the competent math and science male student than female student. Girls who were competent in math and science were encouraged to develop additional competencies in other areas. Levitin and Chananie (1972) presented hypothetical boys and girls characterized by dependency, aggression or achievement. Teachers were asked to indicate their approval, liking and how typical the behavior was of the hypothetical student. They reported less approval for the dependent male than the dependent female, evaluated aggression as typical for males and dependency as typical for females, and indicated greater liking for achieving girls and dependent girls than for dependent boys.

Children's Enactment of Sex Bias. Sex-role differentiation, however, does not only occur in teacher attitudes. Children have learned and incorporated the major components of this process well before they enter primary school. They know their gender identity by age 3 or earlier (Kagan, 1969). By the time they reach preschool, they know which characteristics, behaviors and play activities are appropriate for their sex (Kohlberg, 1966). By age 6 or 7 dichotomized sex-role definitions are thoroughly apparent. The interests, activities and attitudes of boys and girls begin to diverge sharply.

It should not be surprising that children enact these roles in their activities at school. Stein and Smithells (1969) find this not only to be the case, but demonstrate that the organization of achievement areas around gender increases with age. Students in grades 2, 5 and 12 were asked to indicate the appropriateness of six achievement areas for boys and girls in response to the question, "Do you think this is a more boyish or a more girlish thing to do?" On the whole, the children showed remarkable agreement in the areas they assigned to their sex. Age-related differences appeared in the assignments of areas appropriate to the opposite sex. Younger children did not make stereotypic assignments of arithmetic, athletics, and reading, but viewed these areas as appropriate for their own sex. Twelfth graders made stereotypic assignments. Stein and Smithells conclude that sex-role learning includes not only the learning of what is appropriate for one's sex, but also learning what is inappropriate.

Labeling tasks as masculine or feminine has a direct effect on children's approach to or avoidance of such tasks and on the quality of performance in them. Stein et al. (1971) asked children to work on three tasks labeled "masculine," "feminine" and "neutral." They found that boys spent most of their time working on "male" tasks and least time on "female" tasks. Girls spent about the same amount of time on each task. Montemayor (1974) tested the relationship between sex labeling and performance. He found that performance was highest when children received a label for the task that was appropriate for their sex. It was lowest when the task was labeled as inappropriate for the child's sex. This was true for both boys and girls.

Teacher-Student Interaction. The last two studies demonstrate the direct relationship between attitude and behavior. Such a relationship is often less clear. However, attitudinal and behavioral parallels remain striking. The cultural emphasis on achievement and competence for boys is also prominent in studies of behavior observation of classroom student-teacher interaction.

The early work of Meyer and Thomson (1956) showed that 6th grade boys received more disapproval or blame from their teachers than did girls. Boys also received more praise or approval than did girls, although the difference was significant in only one of the three classrooms studied. A larger study by Spaulding (1963) using 21 classrooms at the 4th and 6th grades obtained similar results with regard to disapproval. However, teachers interacted more with boys than with girls on every one of the four major categories of teaching behavior studied: approval, disapproval, instruction, listening to the child. Boys thus received more of the teacher's active attention than did girls. Jackson and Lahaderne (1967) similarly found that 6th grade boys experienced more prohibitory, managerial and instructional contacts with their teachers. Moreover, these three kinds of contacts were positively correlated for boys but not for girls.

Not only do teacher contacts differ for boys and girls, but the extent to which they are contingent on performance also varies. Torrance (1962) asked teachers to describe incidents in which they rewarded creative behavior in the classroom. Rewards consisted of respect for unusual questions and ideas of children, allowing nonevaluative practice, pointing to the consequences of ideas. Teachers reported 224 instances of which 172 mentioned the sex of the child. Of these 72% involved boys and 26% girls. Torrance attributed this difference to the possibility that teachers may be rewarding conformity in girls while creativity was emphasized for boys. While one can only speculate as to the nature of the contingency for girls, it is pertinent to note that the sexes do not differ markedly in creativity.

A recent study by Serbin et al. (1973) finds that differential contingencies for disruptive and dependent behavior are in effect for boys and girls. Teachers react more to aggressive behavior by boys. In response to dependent behavior teachers attend more to girls when they are proximal. However, responses to solicitation by boys contain more directions and instructions. Boys also receive more attention than girls for appropriate classroom behavior. It appears that all activities of boys, appropriate and inappropriate, attract more teacher attention. Girls are more likely to be ignored, except when directly beside the teacher. Good et al. (1973) finds that, regardless of the sex of the teacher, boys are more active and more frequent interactions with the teacher take place. Boys are asked a higher proportion of problem-solving questions, while girls are asked more questions requiring routine answers. Boys receive both more positive and more negative contacts from teachers, with high-achieving boys receiving most favorable teacher treatment. Learning opportunities for girls are thus limited because of less attention and information from teachers. The attention which they do receive is contingent on appropriate feminine behavior.

Boys receive the behavioral criticism and disciplinary contacts that train them to be less impulsive. At the same time they receive encouragement and attention in academic areas. This is also reflected in the greater differentiation in teacher's perception of the academic abilities of boys. Jackson (1968) found that teachers were better in distinguishing and identifying boys who were dissatisfied or satisfied with school. They were significantly less able to do so with girls. Sears and Feldman (1966) found that when rating pupils, teachers showed different patterns of encouragement for the sexes. They distinguished between bright boys and boys of average ability. They encouraged self-sufficiency for the bright boys and good work habits for the average boys. No such distinction between bright and average girls was made. Both groups of girls were encouraged to be friendly and agreeable. McIntyre et al. (1966) found a similar tendency of greater differentiation for boys than for girls in their teacher samples. Work habits and performance were not emphasized.

While girls received less academic attention, encouragement for appropriate independent and assertive behavior appears to be completely lacking. Not one study could be found that treated the profession's concern with the development of independence in girls. We did find an unequal concern for the effect of schooling on boys in the claim that schools "feminize" boys. Pollack (1968, p. 57) writes, "Countless teachers, the overwhelming majority of whom are women, expect boy pupils to behave, react, and learn like girls. Even though frequently unaware of it, many of these women value neatness and cleanliness above individual initiative. They prefer conformity, mental passivity, and gentle obedience--at which girls excel--to the aggressive drive and originality of many boys." Sexton (1965, p. 57) characterizes the schools' feminizing influence in a similar fashion: "...the school is too much a woman's world, governed by women's rules and standards.... Though the boy must learn to be his own authority, the school insists that he obey its authority.... This is not good preparation for manhood." The statements are unsound in their stereotypic assessments and in their unequal values for the two genders. Although largely staffed by women, it does not follow that the stereotypes attributed to women also accurately characterize the effects of the educational institutions they work in. The authors' concerns reflect an unequal concern with the full development of boys. The constraints that schools place on girls are accepted as appropriate. Such statements are ethically unacceptable. Educators cannot affirm anything less than the full development of both boys and girls.

Socialization Processes

What are the mechanisms through which sex roles are acquired and maintained? Psychologists have postulated and researched a number of processes, the most prominent being identification and imitation. The psychoanalytic theory of identification holds that children identify with parents and acquire their characteristics through the resolution of the Oedipus Complex. Because of the untestable nature of the theory, it has largely receded as a fruitful direction of inquiry. Modeling appeared initially a promising explanation for sex-role learning. It was thought that the same-sex model was more available to the child and that the child chose to imitate the same-sex parent. Actually, children are exposed to many models and do not confine imitation to same-sex parents. Maccoby (1974) and others distinguish between acquisition of behavior and performance of that behavior. Children acquire familiarity with many behaviors but they do not perform them all. Performance is selective. Maccoby suggests that the basis for selection is approval or knowledge of appropriate behavior through social reinforcement.

The research reviewed above appears to support Maccoby. The findings point to the informational character of the social context which functions in a manner that maintains sex-role differentiation in beliefs and overt behavior of individuals. Through some information-dependent process acts are assigned meaning and legitimized as gender appropriate or inappropriate. However, it is still unclear how reinforcement accomplishes this. Two decades of research on social reinforcement have yielded results that are ambiguous, contradictory or too complex to interpret (Stevenson, 1972). The primary focus of this work has been the assessment of the effectiveness of various reinforcers for performance: positive and negative reinforcement, verbal and material reinforcement, praise and criticism, etc. The results have been remarkably inconclusive. Thus, neither positive or negative reinforcement facilitates or depresses performance to a greater extent. Although class differences in the use of praise and criticism and sex differences in exposure to praise or criticism have been obtained, it is difficult to interpret these results, since the effects of such reinforcers are unclear.

Recent research has investigated the effects of noncontingent reinforcement. It is this direction of research which appears most promising and relevant to the hypothesis proposed in this paper and implemented in the curriculum "Competence Is for Everyone." In a series of studies Seligman (1975) has found that independence between an organism's responses and the outcomes it experiences leads to learned helplessness. That is, when an organism can make no response that controls an aversive outcome, the organism becomes helpless. Seligman compared the performance of naive dogs in escape/avoidance training with dogs who experienced inescapable shock prior to escape/avoidance training. He found that naive dogs learned to escape shock. Dogs exposed to inescapable shock reduced the normal initial search activity. On subsequent trials they did not learn to avoid shock and quietly submitted to shock. The effect of noncontingent shock is that it reduces initiatory activity or motivation, greatly reduces learning and results in emotional disorganization in the form of anxiety and depression. These results have been replicated with a number of animal species and humans. Pervin (1963) has studied the effects of predictability and control on performance and subjective preference, anxiety, pain and reaction time in humans. The procedure consisted of administering mild electric shock which was varied in predictability of onset of shock and subjects' control of shock administration. Predictability and control were rated more desirable, less painful and anxiety-arousing than unpredictability and noncontrol of shock. Thornton and Jacobs (1971) also found that reaction time decreased with unpredictable variable shock. The effect of unpredictability in humans bears a striking resemblance to the effects obtained by Seligman in his animal studies. The results are a reduction in performance and an increase in emotional arousal. In her work with children Dweck (1973) has found that learned helplessness leads to decreased achievement striving in children. Children displayed remarkable deterioration in performance and attributed failure to external circumstances beyond their control. Glass and Singer (1972) found that the mere belief that people have control over aversive events maintains performance at normal levels. Hiroto and Seligman (1974) also found that instructional sets that inform individuals whether their performance is dependent on chance or skill produce similar performance decrements under chance instructions. Individuals who scored high on external locus of control exhibited helplessness more quickly than internals. Seligman and others have also found that uncontrollable reward has similar debilitating effects on the initiation of activities, on learning and on competitiveness.

In all of these studies subjects learn that responses and outcomes are independent of each other. This diminishes initiation or responding to control the outcome. It produces a belief that one's activities are controlled by external events and it reduces learning. Emotionally, it produces heightened anxiety and depression. Seligman sees this process as consisting of two components: the contingency of outcome upon responses, which is a property of the environment, and a cognitive representation of this in the form of expectation, which is a property of the organism. It is the cognitive representation of this process, the expectation, that accounts for helplessness.

Seligman's work is particularly relevant in providing clues about the possible cause of the sex differences discussed earlier. A number of these resemble the effects of learned helplessness: external locus of control, attribution to luck, fear of success. We purpose that verbal reinforcement in human behavior is considerably more complicated than aversive shock. If one looks closely at verbal reinforcement, it becomes clear that it is not only positive or negative, contingent and noncontingent; it also specifies the thing it refers to. The referent may not necessarily be the activity an individual is engaged in. For example, a teacher may tell a pupil "That drawing is poor" while the child is sketching a picture. The reinforcement is contingent on the child's behavior and the referent of the reinforcing term "poor" is "drawing." In this case the child's behavior and the referent in the statement coincide. However, take the same situation and substitute the comment, "You are an awful child." The reinforcement is still contingent on the child's behavior, but the referent of the term "awful" is not the behavior of the child but the child itself. Contingency is generally defined in terms of its relation to responses. But, the stated referent of the reinforcement terms need not necessarily be the ongoing responses, as the above example illustrates. The statement "You are an awful child" gives the pupil no information about his/her performance but it does tell him/her what sort of person he/she is.

Instead of social reinforcement, we shall term such statements "evaluative appraisals." They are evaluative in that they directly use terms connoting "good" and "bad." They are appraisals because they pass judgment by applying evaluative terms to acts or entities. In the context of interpersonal interaction, evaluative appraisals can refer to acts or to the person performing an act. That is, they specify a referent which can be the task a person is engaged in (e.g., your work is bad) or the performer of the task (e.g., you are bad). Task- or person-oriented evaluative appraisals should have different consequences for learning or performance and for the learner or performer. Task-oriented appraisals give the actor information about his/her performance and should facilitate performance, regardless of whether the appraisals are positive or negative. Person-oriented appraisals inform the individual of the quality of his/her character. Positive personalized appraisals provide the performer with an understanding of the desirable qualities of his/her character, result in positive affect, and a positive self-image. It can undermine performance in its lack of information, in disorienting the performer by focusing on him/her and in giving the impression that "everything is all right" when in fact it may not be, when feedback about performance is needed. Negative personalized appraisal provides the performer with an understanding of the reprehensible qualities of his/her character, results in negative affect and a negative self-image. It should undermine performance through its lack of information, the disorientation of performer by focusing on him/her rather than the activities. A preponderance of such appraisal should result in deterioration of learning and performance, increased arousal and emotional disorganization, feelings of helplessness and inadequate overt responding because of the lack of task-related information, and in a negative conception of self.

The effects of the discontinuity of performance-unrelated personalized appraisal are reinforced by a second discontinuity not yet discussed. In an earlier study on humiliation (Kent, 1974) it was found that humiliations were appraisals which occurred in performance settings. However, they did not comment on the performance but on the character of the performer. The woman who met with her thesis committee to discuss her work and was asked, "Why don't you get pregnant and fulfill yourself?" exemplifies this. It was also found that the content of these comments were inconsistent. Subjects were put down for being competent and incompetent, attractive and unattractive, dependent and independent. In addition to being task irrelevant, the appraisals were contradictory. Thus, three types of discontinuities can be present in evaluative appraisal: noncontingent appraisal (as discussed by Seligman), personalized appraisal of task performance, and inconsistent content of personalized appraisal. The simultaneous occurrence of all three discontinuities in appraisal should, indeed, produce aversive effects.

Keeping the consequences of evaluative appraisal in mind, two additional facts need to be mentioned. The major component of meaning of words in the English language is the evaluative component. That is, many words in our language convey connotations of "good" or "bad." We thus have a large portion of our language at our disposal to make evaluative judgments. A second fact about our language is its preponderance of trait terms (e.g., strong, intelligent, charming, etc.). Allport (1936) counted 18,000 trait terms in Webster's. This means that we have many words at our disposal to characterize individuals. Many of these terms constitute a masculine-feminine dimension and are used to characterize males or females.

Given these facts, we can see that evaluative appraisal is a rather efficient socializing mechanism. One inappropriate personalized appraisal simultaneously (1) defines the individual (2) interrupts the task the person is engaged in (3) provides no information about the task (4) creates an unpleasant emotional state. The result is that the individual will avoid the task and will know who he/she is.

REFERENCES

Aderer, A. A survey of secondary school teachers' sex-role stereotypes and sex-typed classroom behaviors. Unpublished paper, Teachers College, Columbia University, January, 1972.

Allport, G.W. & Odbert, H. Trait names: A psycholexical study. Psychological Monographs, 1936, 47, No. 211.

Bardwick, J. Psychology of Women: A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bar-Tal, D. and Frieze, I. Achievement motivation and gender as determinants of attributions for success and failure. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of pre-school behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1971, 4, 1.

Benton, A.A., Gleber, E.R., Kelley, H.H., and Liebling, B.A. Reactions to various degrees of deceit in a mixed-motive relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 170-180.

Block, J. Conceptions of sex role: some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. Bernard Moses Memorial Lecture, Mimeo, 1972, unpublished.

Brim, O.G., Jr., Glass, D., Neulinger, J., and Firestone, I.J. American Beliefs and Attitudes about Intelligence. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., and Vogel, S.R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Carlson, R. Stability and change in the adolescent's self image. Child Psychology, 1965, 36, 659-666.

Carey, G.L. Sex differences in problem-solving performance as a function of attitude differences. J. Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 256-60.

Crandall, V.J., and Robson, A. Children's repetition choices in an intellectual achievement situation following success and failure. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 97, 161.

Crandall, V.J., Katkowsky, W., and Preston, A. Motivational and ability determinants of young children's intellectual achievement behaviors. Child Development, 1962, 33, 643-61.

Crandall, V.J., Dewey, R., Katowsky, W., and Preston, A. Parents' attitudes and behaviors and grade school children's academic achievements. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 104, 53-66.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

Crandall, V.C. Sex differences in expectancy of intellectual and academic reinforcement. In C.P. Smith, ed., *Achievement-related motives in children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Deaux, K., and Taynor, J. Evaluation of male and female ability: Bias works two ways. *Psych. Rep.*, 1973, *32*, 261-262.

Deaux, K., and Farris, E. Attributing causes for one's own performance: The effects of sex, norms, and outcome. Unpublished paper, Purdue University, 1974.

Deaux, K., and Emswiller, T. Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *J. Personality & Social Psychology*, 1974, *29*, 80-85.

Deaux, K., White, L., and Farris, E. Skill versus luck: Field and laboratory studies of male and female preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, in press.

Dweck, C.S., and Reppucci, N.D. Learned helplessness and reinforcement responsibility in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1973, *25*, 109-116.

Eagly, A.H., and Whiteheard, G.I. Effect of choice on receptivity to favorable and unfavorable evaluations of oneself. *J. Personality & Social Psychology*, *22*, 223-30.

Epstein, C.F. Women's place: options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Feather, N.T. Attribution of responsibility and valance of success and failure in relation to initial confidence and task performance. *J. Personality & Social Psychology*, 1969, *13*, 129-44.

Fisher, J.E., O'Neal, E.G., and McDonald, P.J. Female competitiveness as function of prior performance outcome, competitor's evaluation, and sex of competitor. Paper presented at meeting of Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, 1974.

Gaite, A.J.H. Teachers' perceptions of ideal male and female students: Male chauvinism in the schools. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1972.

Glass, D.C., and Singerm, J.E. *Urban stress: Experiments on noise and social stressors*. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? *Trans-Action*, 1968, 28-30.

Good, T.L., Sikes, J.N., and Brophy, J.E. Effects of the teacher sex and student sex on classroom interaction. *J. of Educational Psychol.*, 1973, *65*, 74-87.

Hatfield, J.S., Ferguson, L.R., and Alpert, R. Mother-child interaction and the socialization process. *Child Development*, 1967, *38*, 365-414.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

Hill, K.T., and Sarason, S.B. The relation of test anxiety and defensiveness to test and school performance over the elementary-school years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1966, 31, no. 104.

Hilton, T.L., and Berglund, G.W. Sex differences in mathematics achievement -- a longitudinal study. Educational Testing Service Research Bulletin, 1971.

Hiroto, D.S., and Seligman, M.E. Generality of learned helplessness in man. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974.

Hoit, J. How children fail. New York: Delta, 1964.

Horner, M. Fail: Bright women. Psychology Today, 1969, 3, 36-38.

Horner, M.S. Femininity and successful achievement: Basic inconsistency. In Bardwick, J.M., Donovan, E., Horner, M.S., and Gutman, D. Feminine Personality and Conflict. Belmont, Cal.: Brooks Cole, 1970, 45-74.

Hutt, C. Curiosity in young children. Science Journal, 1970, 6, 68-71.

Illich, I. After deschooling, what? Social Policy, 1971, 5-13.

Jackson, P.W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Jackson, P.W., and Lahaderne, H.M. Inequalities of teachers-pupil contacts. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4, 204-211.

Kagan, J. On the meaning of behavior: illustrations from the infant. Child Development, 1969, 40, 1121-1134.

Katz, P.A., and Zigler, E. Self-image disparity: a developmental approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 186-195.

Kent, M. Higher education and gender role socialization, in Graduate and Professional Education of Women, American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.: Banta Press, 1974.

Klein, X.V. The stereotype of femininity. Journal of Social Issues, 1960, 6, 3-12.

Kohlberg, L. A cognitive developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. Maccoby, The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Lambert, W.E., Yackley, A., and Hein, R.N. Child training values of English Canadian and French Canadian parents. Canadian J. Behavioral Science, 1971, 3, 217-36.

Leventhal, G.S., and Lane, D.W. Sex, age and equity behavior. J. Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 312-16.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

Levitin, T.W., and Chananie, J.D. Responses of female primary school teachers to sex-typed behaviors in male and female children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1309-16.

Long, B.H., Henderson, E.H., and Ziller, R.C. Self-ratings on the semantic differential: content versus response set. Child Development, 1968, 39, 647-56.

MacBrayer, C.T. Differences in perception of the opposite sex by males and females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 309-314.

Maccoby, E.E. (ed). The development of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Maccoby, E.E., and Jacklin, C.N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.

McIntyre, D., Morrison, A., and Sutherland, J. Social and educational variables relating to teachers' assessment of primary school pupils. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 36, 272-279.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., and Lowell, E.G. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McKee, J.P., and Sherriffs, A.C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

Makosky, V.P. Fear of success, sex-role orientation of the task, and competitive conditions as variables affecting women's performance in achievement-oriented situations. Paper presented at meeting of Midwestern Psychological Association, Cleveland, 1972.

Marecek, J. When stereotypes hurt: responses to dependent and aggressive communications. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meeting, 1974.

Mendelsohn, G.A., and Griswold, G.G. Anxiety and repression as predictors of the use of incidental cues in problem solving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 353-359.

Meyer, W., and Thompson, G. Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 385-396.

Minton, C., Kagan, J., and Levine, J.A. Maternal control and obedience in the two-year-old. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1873-94.

Monohan, L., Kuhn, D., and Shaver, P. Intrapsychic versus cultural explanations of the "fear of success" motive. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 60-64.

Montanelli, D.S., and Hill, K.T. Children's achievement expectations and performance as a function of two consecutive reinforcement experiences, sex of subject, and sex of experimenter. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 115-128.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

Montemayor, R. Children's performance in a game and their attraction to it as a function of sex-typed labels. Child Development, 1974, 45, 152-156.

Omark, D.R., Omark, M., and Edelman, M. Dominance hierarchies in young children. Paper presented at International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago, 1973.

Pervin, L.A. The need to predict and control under conditions of threat. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 570-585.

Pheterson, G.I., Kiesler, S.B., and Goldberg, P.A. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement, and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-18.

Pohlman, E.H. Psychology of birth planning. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Shenkman, 1969.

Pollack, J.H. Are teachers fair to boys? Today's Health, 1968, 46, 21.

Reimer, E. An Essay on Alternatives in Education. Cuernavaca, Mexico: CIDOC Cuaderno No. 1005, 1970.

Rosenkrantz, P.S., Vogel, S.R., Bee, H., Broverman, I.K., and Broverman, D.M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Rubin, J.Z., Provenzano, F.J., and Luria, Z. The eye of the beholder: parent's views on sex of newborns. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 44, 512-19.

Scheinfeld, A. Women and men. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1944.

Sears, R.R., Maccoby, E.E., and Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sears, R.R., Rau, L., and Alpert, R. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Sears, P., and Feldman, D.H. Teacher interactions with boys and girls. National Elementary Principal, November, 1966, 46, 30-35.

Seligman, M.E. Helplessness: On depression, development and death. San Francisco: Freedman, 1975.

Serbin, L.A., O'Leary, K.D., Kent, R.N., and Tonick, I.J. A comparison of teacher response to the pre-academic and problem behavior of boys and girls. Child Development, 1973, 44, 796-804.

Sexton, P. Schools are emasculating our boys. Saturday Review, June 19, 1965, 57.

Spaulding, R.L. Achievement, creativity, and self-concept correlates of teacher-pupil transactions in elementary schools. Cooperative Research Project No. 1352, Washington, D.C., D.H.E.W., Office of Education, 1963.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. Who likes competent women: Competence, sex-role congruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 1, 197-213.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. Likeability, sex-role congruence of interest, and competence: It all depends on how you ask. Journal of Applied Psychology, in press.

Stein, A.H., Pohly, S., Pohly, R., and Mueller, E. The influence of masculine, feminine, and neutral tasks on children's achievement behavior, expectancies of success, and attainment values. Child Development, 1971, 42, 195-207.

Stein, A.H. and Smithells, J. Age and sex difference in children's sex-role standards about achievement. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 252.

Stevenson, H.W. Child's Learning. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Thornton, J.W. and Jacobs, P.D. Learned helplessness in human subjects. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1971, 87, 369-372.

Torrence, E.P. Changing reactions of preadolescent girls to tasks requiring creative scientific thinking. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1963, 102, 217-223.

Walberg, H.J. Physics, femininity, and creativity. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 47-54.

Whiting, B., and Pope, C. A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the behavior of children aged three to eleven. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974.

CULTURE AND GENDER ROLES:
THERE'S NO UNISEX IN THE NURSERY

Michael Lewis

For a long time psychology has been concerned with individual differences. Its root question continues to be: how and why are individuals (and groups) different from one another? Just as revealing would be a psychology that seeks ways in which people are similar to one another or seeks educational programs that result in similar performance among different persons. Psychology might more profitably concern itself with the process that produces individual differences than with the differences themselves.

This concern with individual differences is mirrored in society. It is particularly noticeable in matters pertaining to gender, especially sex as a physiological fact. Many persons have found that a formerly unexceptional statement like "Boys and girls are different" now sets off furious blasts among interest groups from women's liberation to gay liberation. On the basis of present information, no one can demonstrate either that the differences between the sexes are solely learned or that they are biologically determined. I am here concerned with what we can observe happening in the life of a very young child as a function of his or her sex.

Prefer. Mothers and fathers respond to boy infants in one way and to girl infants in another way. To take just one of many instances, girl infants are talked to much more than boy infants are. This fact is sometimes advanced to explain female precocity -- girls acquire language much earlier than boys. Yet research has shown that girl infants respond more to auditory stimuli than boys do, and this would suggest a basic biological difference that parents, presumably being the most acute and interested of observers, respond to.

All we can say at the moment is that an infant's sex is very important to his or her parents. Long before the birth of their child, before they know how big it will be, what kind of temperament it will have, whether it will be healthy or not, parents express (or suppress) their preferences for the sex of the child, and select names that will label it according to its sex. (I am, of course, talking about the American culture. In some societies, the naming process is frequently a more individual thing, depending on the unique circumstances of birth, time, or place; in others, individuals often name themselves, at a time that they deem proper, in response to some interior vision of their life's significance or to an external event that in some way bears upon their sense of self.)

Kick. In 1969 L.W. Sontag, W.G. Steele and I studied fetal behavior in the last three months of pregnancy. Although we obtained no direct data, it was our distinct impression that mothers responded to the activity of the fetus in a sex-differentiated way. When the fetus was active -- if it kicked and moved a great deal -- the mother interpreted this as a sign that the child probably was male. And all of us are familiar with the folk wisdom that relates a child's prenatal position to its sex — boys supposedly are carried high and girls are carried low.

After the child is born, parents vary their behavior qualitatively and measurably according to the child's sex. As early as three months of age, boys and girls are behaving in measurably different ways. Which parental behaviors contribute to these sex differences?

Touch. I shall concentrate on the mother-infant dyad, because it is fundamental to personality and social development. Let's use the term attachment behavior to describe the variety of actions that make up the intense, interpersonal relationship between mother and infant. It is convenient to distinguish among two broad classes of attachment behavior. The first, which I'll call proximal behavior, has to do with physical contact -- touching, holding, rocking, caressing, kissing, etc. The other, called distal behavior, has to do with activities that achieve or maintain contact other than by touching: smiling, looking at, talking to, gesturing at, etc.

In a series of related studies, my colleagues and I have analyzed the behavior of mothers and infants. We studied the infants at the ages of 12 weeks, six months, and 13 months. In the first two series of studies, we visited in the homes and observed the attachment behavior of mothers and infants in the course of a normal day. In the third series, for the 13-month-olds, we added an experimental setting that we called a free-play situation. This was a room marked off into squares and containing a number of toys. We asked each mother to sit in a chair and watch her child play for 15 minutes. As we observed the mothers and children, we analyzed four major types of behavior: vocalization, looking at, touching, and proximity-seeking (how far from the mother the child ventured, and how long he or she remained in areas distant from the mother). At the end of the 15-minute session, we placed a fence, which we called a frustration barrier, in the middle of the room, separating mother and child.

These studies show that from the earliest age, girl infants are looked at and talked to more than boy infants. For the first six months or so, boy infants have more physical contact than girl infants, but by the time boys are six months old, this reverses and girls get more physical contact and more nontouching contact.

By the time they reach 13 months, boys venture significantly farther from their mothers, stay away from their mothers for longer periods of time, and look at and talk to their mothers less often than do girls of the same age.

Boys play more vigorously with toys, often banging them together, and play significantly more with nontoys (doorknobs, light switches, and other room equipment). A boy also responds with more overt aggression to the frustration barrier; he attempts to get around it, instead of standing in the middle of the room and crying.

In trying to explain these results, I might first point out that what the parent does to the infant, the infant is likely to do back. This is, in fact, the implicit intent of most behavior, and this is why we can refer to most behavior as socializing — as intended to indicate or shape acceptable social responses. It seems clear that moving the infant from physical-contact interaction to nontouching interaction is an early and major end of the socialization of interpersonal behavior.

Face-to-face, frontal, bodily contact between infant and mother must eventually change to the visual-verbal interaction of adults. The mother, therefore, moves the child from a close physical contact with its social world to an essentially visual contact. Many different methods are used in this shift. One is simply to turn the infant from a face-to-face to a face-to-back position, the infant facing away from and not touching the mother. This is done with an easy, usually gentle, turning motion. Another technique is to attract the attention of the infant away from the mother by pointing out something in the environment or suggestign that the infant play with some distant object.

This socialization process is carried out and completed, for the most part, within the first two years of life. However, boys are moved faster along than girls are. One-year-old girls are allowed and encouraged to spend significantly more time touching and staying near their mothers than boys are. Girls, too, are moved away from physical contact with their mothers, but later than boys -- and the separation process seems to be less severe for girls than for boys.

Fret. It is difficult to explain why, during their child's first six months of life, mothers touch boy babies more than they touch girls. Perhaps boys are more valuable to the mother than girls. Or boys may be more fretful and upset at birth than girls: newborn boys do in fact cry more than girls, possibly as a consequence of more traumatic birth experiences. It may also be that boys are more readily quieted by physical stimulation than girls are, while auditory stimulation more readily hushes girls. Each of these possibilities deserves investigation.

After this six-month period of "proximal grace," boys are hustled away quickly from touching contact with the mother. The motive appears to be cultural: mothers believe that boys should be more independent than girls and that they should be encouraged to explore and master their world. Exploration, independence, mastery, and other aggressive behaviors or qualities are antithetical to physical contact, and may be antithetical to any close personal contact. In any case, mothers have started to move their sons away from physical contact by the age of six months, and by the age of 13 months, male children show significantly more exploratory and autonomous behavior than girls do. The behavior of fathers toward their children shows similar patterns and apparently has similar motives.

Rules. There clearly is some relationship between these sex-differentiated behavior patterns in childhood and in adult life. In American society, especially in the "traditional" or Puritan-evolved America, we find that men and women are allowed considerably different degrees of freedom in terms of touching behavior.

In general, men may touch women only when sexual relations are possible and acceptable, and may not make physical contact with other men except in circumscribed or unusual contexts. In great excitement -- at a football game, for example -- men are allowed to embrace or hug other men. In extreme emotional distress, as in combat, a man may collapse into the arms of another man; however, even this is looked upon as somewhat unusual. In general, men touch other men only if they are performing a prescribed service such as barbering or doctoring. Even then, the contact is not to be enjoyed: goosebumps from a barber's touch are embarrassing.

Dance. While women in our culture are somewhat restricted in their touching behavior with men, they are allowed much more contact with each other or in many circumstances dance together. It is not unusual to see teen-age girls dancing together on TV rock shows, but two boys are never seen dancing together. This is equally true for older people; two aunts at a wedding dancing together would be considered quite normal, two uncles would not be. It is highly appropriate, indeed incorporate in the feminine ideal, for women to be physically affectionate with children. It is less appropriate for men to demonstrate such physical affection.

Men and women also seem to respond differently to certain kinds of stress, such as overcrowding ("The Crowd -- Maybe Not So Maddening After All," PT, September 1971). In a crowded room, men tend to become more edgy, hostile and aggressive. In the same overcrowded conditions, women tend to become friendlier. It may be that the possibility of unwanted or unacceptable physical contact is in some way responsible for heightened aggression among males.

Other. It is important to recall that I have been talking about a culture in some unitary sense. While these sex-related stereotypes may be true for large segments of our culture, and are generally reflected in the mass media, they are by no means universal. Among Americans of Italian, Greek, Armenian or Jewish ancestry, for example, there appears to be more physical contact among men. It has been noted that Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Latin Americans tend to stand somewhat closer in casual conversation, generating subtle unease in Anglo-Saxons. Infant socialization practices may account in part for such cultural differences.

It might be wondered if anything in these findings is relevant to the women's-liberation movement. In part, they seem to indicate that in interpersonal relationships, women have more freedom of action and more available, more acceptable ways to express their feelings.

This freedom of emotional expression represents a great advantage, one that is to some extent nullified by feelings of self-hate that are common to all groups that are exploited, powerless, or discriminated against.

Thus, many women are contemptuous of other women, which confounds their differential advantage of being allowed more extensive contact and feeling.

Good. It should be obvious that I assume touching behavior to be a primary expressive medium, and that I hold that expression of feelings is necessary and good. One is not likely to have his or her needs fulfilled if he or she cannot express them or must disguise them to the point of unrecognizability. But in societies like our own in which competition is extremely important — in which a male's self-esteem and happiness are directly flavored by his acquisitive success or lack of it -- touching behavior and the emotional responsiveness it engenders may be a severe disadvantage. For this reason, intense social pressures on males discourage interpersonal closeness. Ironically enough, these counterpressures are initially expressed through the mother, and may have as their essential content a simple frustration of vital needs. It is a further irony that men may actually have greater biological need for proximal contact than women have.

It is probably no accident that the new social movements combine a partial rejection of masculine ideals like intense competitiveness or clearly defined sex-related roles with an intensification of touching and feeling interactions, and that these new movements all have a communal rather than individualistic flavor. Knowing this, people interested in feeling and in group interaction must move toward an embrace of the feminine ideal -- the feminization rather than the masculinization of our society.

SEX-ROLE PRESSURES AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE MALE CHILD[1]

Ruth E. Hartley

Lawrence K. Frank recently suggested that current changes in women's social roles are likely to lead to feelings of anxiety, inadequacy and hostility in men because of a lack of synchronization in role-change on their part (13). Increasingly, others have noted evidence of socialization and adjustmental difficulties stemming from male role demands at the adult and adolescent levels (3,5,17,18,19,20,38,39). Differential rates of referral of boys and of girls to child guidance centers have long pointed to markedly greater incidence of failure in social functioning in boys as compared with girls (7, 8, 14, 29, 30, 40). Delinquency rates notoriously have favored young males (36), and recent studies of educational underachievement in the gifted have revealed that underachievement occurs twice as frequently among boys as among girls (16). Finally, a current study of the development of concepts of women's social roles, originally focussed on girls, increasingly has been revealing data pointing to the existence of such exigent stress in the boys' implementation of male roles as to call for serious and systematic examination.

In this paper we shall attempt a preliminary statement of the problem, based on an integration of theory and research findings in the areas of personality and learning processes, along with illustrative case materials, selected from the protocols of 41 young male Ss (8 and 11 years old) interviewed in the course of our study.[2]

One definition might be in order at this point. By "social roles" we mean all the personal qualities, behavioral characteristics, interests, attitudes, abilities and skills that one is expected to have because one occupies a certain status or position; in this case, that of being a male human being. These expectations are usually common to a whole culture and are mediated to the individual child early in life by persons in contact with him or her -- first by parents and other adults who are close, then by peers and adults with whom he or she comes into more casual contact. All sex-connected social roles share in one source of difficulty, that they are defined by forces outside the individual (i.e., the culture into which he or she is born) without any necessarily appropriate reference to particular native endowments, presenting a pattern into which the person must fit him- or herself. This fact is responsible for discomfort enough; to the male role, however, folk myth and social structure combine to impose additional difficulties.

First of all, demands that boys conform to social notions of what is manly come much earlier and are enforced with much more vigor than similar attitudes with respect to girls. Several research studies, using preschool children as their Ss, indicate that boys are aware of what is expected of them because they are boys and restrict their interests and activities to what is suitably "masculine" in the kindergarten (2,4,11, 14,32), while girls amble gradually in the direction of "feminine" patterns for five more years (2,4). In other words, more stringent demands are made on boys than on girls and at an early age, when they are least able to understand either the reasons for or the nature of the demands. Moreover, these demands are frequently enforced harshly, impressing the small boy with the danger of deviating from them, while he does not quite understand what they are. To make matters more difficult, the desired behavior is rarely defined positively as something the child should do, but rather, undesirable behavior is indicated negatively as something he should not do or be -- anything, that is, that the parent or other people regard as "sissy." Thus, very early in life the boy must either stumble on the right path or bear repeated punishment without warning when he accidentally enters into the wrong ones. This situation gives us practically a perfect combination for inducing anxiety -- the demand that the child do something which is not clearly defined to him, based on reasons he cannot possibly appreciate, and enforced with threats, punishments, and anger by those who are close to him. Indeed, a great many boys do give evidence of anxiety centered in the whole area of sex-connected role behaviors, an anxiety which frequently expresses itself in overstraining to be masculine, in virtual panic at being caught doing anything traditionally defined as feminine, and in hostility toward anything even hinting at "femininity," including females themselves. This kind of overreaction is reminiscent of the quality of all strong emotion precipitated early in life before judgment and control have had a chance to develop.

This, however, is only one source of difficulty. Another related one comes from the simple fact that fathers are not at home nearly as much as mothers are. This means that the major psychodynamic process by which sex-roles are learned -- the process of identification -- is available only minimally to boys since their natural identification objects, their fathers, are simply not around much of the time to serve as models (6, 28). Illustrative of the children's awareness of this state of affairs, many Ss expressed themselves in the following vein: "My father . . . I don't see him very often." "It's harder to know about boys (than about girls). . . . Father hardly has time to talk to me." "Men are harder to tell about. . . . To tell the truth, my father isn't around much."

The absence of fathers means, again, that much of male behavior has to be learned by trial and error and indirection. One outcome of this state of affairs is the fact that boys, as a group, tend to resemble their fathers in personality and attitudes much less than girls resemble their mothers. This has been impressively documented by the results of a number of research studies conducted by different workers using different Ss and collecting data by different methods (1, 18, 21, 33, 35).

In addition to the effect of the relative absence of fathers from boys' experience, we also have evidence that the relations between boys and their fathers tend to be less good than those between girls and their mothers or fathers (23, 24, 27). Since identification is affected by the quality of relationships existing between the child and the identification model (25, 37), this diminishes still further the boys' chance to define his sex-roles easily and naturally by using his male parent as a model (5, 26). Boys having trouble in sex-roles, for example, often report their fathers as the punishing agents, their mothers as protectors. Fathers in general seem to be perceived as punishing or controlling agents (9, 10).

Where, then, we might ask, do boys find meaningful, positive guides for the specifics of their behavior as males? The answer seems to point largely to their peer groups and somewhat older youths. For a boy then, contact with, and acceptance by, his peers is tremendously important, because he has to look to them to fill in the gaps in his information about his role as a male, and he has to depend on them to give him practice in it. Unfortunately, both the information and the practice he gets is distorted. Since his peers have no better sources of information than he has, all they can do is to pool the impressions and anxieties they derived from their early training. Thus, the picture they draw is at once oversimplified and overemphasized. It is a picture drawn in black and white, with little or no modulation, and it is incomplete, including only a few of the many elements that go to make up the role of the mature male. Thus, we find overemphasis on physical strength and athletic skills (12, 31, 39), with almost a complete omission of tender feelings or acceptance of responsibility toward those who are weaker. It is, after all, a picture drawn by children and it is not enough. Unfortunately, it is almost all that many boys have to go by, and its power to induce anxiety is amply attested (15, 17, 22, 34, 49).

And now we come to what is perhaps the source of greatest difficulty for the growing boy — the conflict in role demands that our social structure imposes on him. On the one hand, we have insisted that he eschew all "womanly" things almost from the cradle, and enforced these demands in a way that makes whatever is female a threat to him -- for that is what he must not be. Ordinarily, one responds to threat by trying to escape from it or by trying to destroy the threatening object. But this the boy cannot do, for society puts him directly under the jurisdiction of women, without relief, for most of his waking day. On the one hand, he is told that he is supposed to be rugged, independent, able to take care of himself, and to disdain "sissies." On the other, he is forced into close contact with the epitome of all sissy-things -- women -- for most of his day and he is commanded to obey and learn from them. In other words, he is compelled to knuckle under to that which he has been taught to despise. Need we wonder that he tends to rebel at times or has trouble making a smooth adjustment?

Moreover, the demeanor of the women with whom he is forced to associate is often such that the boy feels that women just don't like boys. We found many indications of this belief in our Ss' responses to a hypothetical adoption story that they were asked to complete. Almost invariably mothers were assumed to prefer girls to boys. The reasons given for this were drawn from the boys' own experience with their mothers: "She says boys are rough." "A girl wouldn't be so wild -- she would not run so much and play rough. . . . A girl is more kind." If a mother is assumed to want a boy, it is for a nefarious purpose, as in the following: "She'd want a boy so she can give him to the Indians. . . . Girls are always good."

Admittedly, the pressures of male-oriented socialization are not exerted on all equally. Some suffer more than others, notably those with physical endowments or special abilities which are not congruent with the common cultural definition of the male role, and those who have even poorer opportunities than usual for forming sex-appropriate identifications. Thus, the small boy, the weak boy, the boy whose physical coordination is poor — these are especially penalized. But the lad with better-than-average endowments also suffers if those endowments happen to be in areas not included in the culture's definition of what is "masculine" -- music, for example, or art. It takes an unusually rugged physique to offset the disadvantage of a creative talent.

To illustrate what we mean by the "demands" of the male role, let me quote from the boys themselves. This is what they tell us boys have to know and be able to do -- their view of the masculine role at their own age level (8 and 11 years): they have to be able to fight in case a bully comes along; they have to be athletic; they have to be able to run fast; they must be able to play rough games; they need to know how to play many games -- curb-ball, baseball, basketball, football; they need to be smart; they need to be able to take care of themselves; they should know what girls don't know -- how to climb, how to make a fire, how to carry things; they should have more ability than girls; they need to know how to stay out of trouble; they need to know arithmetic and spelling more than girls do. (The last point is probably the greatest blow of all for an 8-year-old.)

We learn a little more when we ask, "What is expected of boys?" We find that they believe grown-ups expect them to be noisy; to get dirty; to mess up the house; to be naughty; to be "outside" more than girls are; not to be cry-babies; not to be "softies"; not to be "behind" like girls are; and to get into trouble more than girls do. Moreover, boys are not allowed to do the kind of things that girls usually do, but girls may do the kind of things that boys do.

Going beyond the immediate present, this is what the boy sees as his future, described in terms of the things men need to know and be able to do: they need to be strong; they need to be ready to make decisions; they must be able to protect women and children in emergencies; they have to have more manual strength than women; they should know how to carry heavy things; they are the ones to do the hard labor, the rough work, the dirty work, and the unpleasant work; they must be able to fix things; they must get money to support their families; they need "a good business head." In addition to their being the adventurers and protectors, the burden bearers, and the laborers, they also need to know how to take good care of children, how to get along with their wives, and how to teach their children right from wrong.

We are also told that, in contrast to women, men are usually in charge of things, they work very hard and they get tired a lot; they mostly do things for other people; they are supposed to be bolder and more restless, and have more courage than women. Like boys, they, too, mess up the house.

On the positive side, men mostly do what they want to do and are very important. In the family, they are the boss; they have authority in relation to the disposal of monies and they get first choice in the use of the most comfortable chair in the house and the daily paper. They seem to get mad a lot, but are able to make children feel good; they laugh and make jokes more than women do. Compared with mothers, fathers are more fun to be with; they are exciting to have around; they have the best ideas.

One wonders, looking over these items, whether the compensations are enough to balance the weight of the burdens that boys see themselves as assuming in order to fulfill the male role adequately. Looked at from this point of view, the question is not why boys have difficulty with this role, but why they try as hard as they do to fulfill it. Perhaps a glance at the characteristics of the female role from the boys' eye view can give us the answer.

Concerning girls, boys tell us: they have to stay close to the house; they are expected to play quietly and be gentler than boys; they are often afraid; they must not be rough; they have to keep clean; they cry when they are scared or hurt; they are afraid to go to rough places like rooftops and empty lots; their activities consist of "fopperies" like playing with dolls, fussing over babies, and sitting and talking about dresses; they need to know how to cook, sew and take care of children, but spelling and arithmetic are not as important for them as for boys. Though reeking of limitation and restraint, this picture is not very full. Not until we ask about adult women do we get any sort of depth or reflection of the affective aspects of the female role.

Concerning adult women we are told: they are indecisive, they are afraid of many things; they make a fuss over things; they get tired a lot; they very often need someone to help them; they stay home most of the time; they are not as strong as men; they don't like adventure; they are squeamish about seeing blood; they don't know what to do in an emergency; they cannot do dangerous things; they are more easily damaged than men; and they die more easily than men. Moreover, they are "lofty" about dirty jobs; they feel themselves above manual work; they are scared of getting wet or getting an electric shock; they cannot do things men do because they have a way of doing things the wrong way; they are not very intelligent; they can only scream in an emergency where a man would take charge. Women are the ones who have to keep things neat and tidy and clean up household messes; they feel sad more often than men. Although they make children feel good, they also make boys carry heavy loads; haul heavy shopping carts uphill; keep them from going out when they want to go, or demand that they stay out when they want to come in. They take the pep out of things and are fussy about children's grades. They very easily become jealous and envy their husbands.

Concerning women's traditional household activities, we get the following reflections: "They are always at those crazy household duties and don't have time for anything else." "Their work is just regular drudging." "Women do things like cooking and washing and sewing because that's all they can do." "If women were to try to do men's jobs the whole thing would fall apart with the women doing it." "Women haven't enough strength in the head or in the body to do most jobs." "In going to adventurous places women are pests -- just a lot of bother. They die easily and they are always worried about their petticoats." "I don't know how women would get along without men doing the work." Natural exploiters, women are good people to stay away from because, as one boy told us, "If I play with my mother, I'll end up doing the dishes and she'll be playing with my father."

When he sees women as weak, easily damaged, lacking strength in mind and in body, able to perform only the tasks which take the least strength and are of least importance, what boy in his right senses would not give his all to escape this alternative to the male role? For many, unfortunately, the scramble to escape takes on all the aspects of panic, and the outward semblance of non-femininity is achieved at a tremendous cost of anxiety and self-alienation. From our data, we would infer that the degree of anxiety experienced has a direct relationship to the degree of pressure to be "manly" exerted on the boy, the rigidity of the pattern to which he is pressed to conform, the availability of a good model, and the apparent degree of success which his efforts achieve.

Variations in degree of anxiety and in modes of handling it are reflected in the observable range of boys' responses to the socialization pressures put on them. In our sample of Ss, we have identified four major configurations[3] thus far: (a) overstriving, with explicit hostility expressed against the opposite sex and with marked rigidity concerning the differentiation between the role activities assigned to men and those assigned to women; (b) over-striving with less hostility, but with marked rigidity; (c) a tendency to give up the struggle, accompanied by protest against social expectations; and (d) a successful, well-balanced implementation of the role, which is positive in approach, showing clear differentiation between concepts of male and of female roles, but with an understanding of the complementary relationships between the roles, and marked flexibility in relation to the activities assignable to them. The cases below illustrate three of these patterns.

T.D. exemplifies the pattern of hostile over-striving with extreme rigidity of sex-role concepts.

For example, when asked whether women ever do things like fixing electric cords, driving trucks, giving sermons (activities which he reported as assigned to men), he responded, "No, women never do that. I think it isn't right for them to do it. Who asked them to do it? I don't trust women doing anything." When asked what most people thought about women doing "men's jobs," he said, "They're just no good -- like women presidents. If we had a woman in Congress and taking over everything, probably the Russians would attack tomorrow if they knew about it -- if we had a war, they would tell everybody to put down their arms. They'd probably make it life imprisonment for any boy or man who strikes a girl. I wouldn't even trust a woman as a doctor. You never know what they are going to do next."

Concerning girls, T.D. made the following remarks: "They're getting too smart now. Before, only the boys gave wise-cracks; now, girls do too. Now, some are too advanced. They use double talk. They talk, well, it's like a college man to a junior high -- they make us look like fools in front of everybody."

In a discussion concerning working wives, this boy said: "I don't like women working. They get in the way. I don't care for females. I don't like females. I say that men could live better by themselves." Concerning marriage, T.D. said, "I don't like to. The only way I'll get closest to marriage is being engaged for five years. I don't like the idea."

His ideas concerning activities appropriate for men were just as rigid as his attitude concerning the proper place for women. When asked what he thought about men doing things like cooking, teaching small children, working in a sewing factory (activities he had assigned to women), he said, "It's not right for them (the men) to be at work they are not fitted for . . . just the women think that men should. Most men think they shouldn't do it." Asked if there was anything he thought men should never do, he said positively, "Take care of the house."

Concerning mothers working, he was sure that they ought not to do it. If his own mother wanted to go to work he would not permit it. Asked to imagine that he might be married in the future, and what he thought he might do around the house, he replied, "Lie around and watch T.V., or it's just going to be a losing fight and I'll be washing floors or shopping. Every boy and man I know hates to go shopping. Men do it but boys put up a fight."

In contrast to T.D. a few brief excerpts from the file of R.J. will serve to clarify what we mean by "rigidity" and "flexibility" in relation to sex-role differentiation.

Asked about the appropriateness of women doing the kind of work R.J. had assigned to men, he said, "I think they should know about things like that before they tried it . . . I think it is a good idea that they know, so if they were alone they could do them (meaning traditional "male" home activities like mending electric plugs, etc.) without calling somebody else in. Asked if there were things women should never do, R.J. said, "No, I think it should be fun for women to do things like that, to show other women that women can do hard jobs and take it, too." In response to our question about the appropriateness of men doing "women's work," R.J. replied, "I think a man should do that sometimes and let the wife take a rest (referring to domestic chores). As for being a secretary and things like that, I think men should, if they know how to do it and like it."

Concerning child care and household activities, R.J. said, "I think they (women) feel responsible for making children happy and helping children to understand. They, well . . . women want to feel that they are needed and someone wants them very much." Concerning domestic routines, he stated, "I don't think they enjoy it but I think they feel they have to make their children happy and to help them along. They do it to help the child grow to be a good mature fellow so that he'll help other people. I don't think most women enjoy working around the house all the time and doing those things, but someone has to help the family out, and that someone has to take care of the children and things like that, so they'll grow up to be good people."

The tolerance and sensitivity to human values indicated by R.J.'s judgments can be appropriately evaluated in the light of his place among his peers. From his teacher we learn that his self-confidence never seems to falter, he is physically well coordinated, and excels in baseball, basketball, and other sports. On the playground and in the classroom he is the unquestioned leader of his group. Of all our Ss, this boy seemed to be most at ease and comfortable in all his role activities.

On the other end of the scale from the overstriving lads we find K.M., a boy with transparently damaged self-esteem who, although he clearly perceives the role definitions imposed by society, protests them helplessly.

To begin with, K.M. is certain that grown-ups prefer girls to boys. He indicates this by telling us, in discussing a story about a hypothetical adoption, that he knows both his mother and his father would prefer a girl to a boy. His mother would want a girl because "she would help around the house. . . . A girl is more kind . . . and, well, she knows how wild I am." He thinks his father would prefer a girl because he has a younger sister; his father plays with her more and "is always kissing her." These responses should be evaluated against a background of responses from many other Ss, most of whom assume that fathers, at least, prefer boys. K.M. departs from the norm of our sample also by saying that when he marries he would prefer all his children to be girls. This is the reason he gives: "All our neighbors around the block have girls and they are so cute. . . . Some girls are much smarter than boys. . . . Well, in all the grades I had all the girls were smarter than boys. . . . Just a couple of the boys were smarter."

K.M. indicates an awareness of lack in relation to his own male role by giving himself a mark of 80 in male role skills and a mark of 95 in female role skills. He explains this discrepancy by saying, "I do know what girls need to know better than what boys need to know. It is harder to know about boys -- you get scolded more than girls and the teacher is always yelling at you if you are a boy."

Not only is K.M. aware of his own limitations, but he knows what other people think of them. In discussing the appropriateness of "women's activities" for men he says, "(most people) care, but they don't say anything about it (if a man performs traditional women's activities). They don't say anything, but they think he is crazy or nuts."

However, K.M. does not think that there are things men should never do -- except getting drunk or breaking the law. In contrast to most of his peers, he indicates that he does not think this is the best of all possible worlds. In relation to sex roles, he believes that improvements should be made -- with machines, for example. "It makes things easier -- if it is a man's job, the women can even do it then." Similarly, although he feels that most vocational activities are satisfactorily apportioned between men and women, he thinks they should do the same things around the home, like washing dishes and taking care of the children.

To a boy in K.M.'s situation girls who are tom-boys present a real threat because they emphasize the boy's own failure. Talking about the "tom-girl" who had been in his class the year before he said, "Everybody was scared of her, even me. She played football and did everything that boys did. She obeyed the stronger boys though . . . . One day she gave practically all the boys in class their social science lessons. I didn't get them, though . . . . There is even one in my class this year. There always is. S.E. Beats everybody up. Every year there is one in the class." The last statement seems to embody K.M.'s resignation to a permanent secondary place, not only in relation to the other boys, but even in contacts with girlish imitators of boys.

Difficulties with sex-roles spill over into the classroom. The teacher of T.D., for example, confesses that she has no idea what he is like. "I have never really been able to reach T . . . . I really don't know what he knows, what he does not know, or what he does not care to know. I have not been able to find out too much about him. He is very quiet. He is not really one of the most normal boys in the class and I do not think he associates with most of the boys." Apparently, most of the time T.D. daydreams in class or draws pictures of boats. He evidently has no intention of letting his teacher, who is one of the despised and exploiting females, get close enough to him to sense the quality of his thoughts, nor has he any intention of producing any work for her. He presents a clearcut example of passive resistance. Knowing how hostile he feels about women in general, we are not surprised that he takes refuge behind a blank facade in her presence.

K.M.'s teacher describes him as a "foolish boy who irritates the class through his thoughtless teasing and picking at them." In his bids for attention and acceptance he involves other youngsters in small misdemeanors which bring reprimands from the teacher and result in his rejection by most of his classmates. He tends to shy away from anything that is competitive and challenging and "requires constant prodding in his school work." Poor vision and poor coordination add to his difficulties on the playground and in the classroom. Although he is a gifted musician, this does not seem to help him gain status either with his peers or with his teacher, both of whom seem to regard this as another indication of his lack of manliness.

Although, as we have indicated before, initial difficulties in the male role may be based on constitutional lack and on poor models, the boy's response to his sex-role demands is often complicated by the quality of his intra-family relationships. T.D.'s younger sister who is receiving more attention than he and his brother may account for some of his hostility, as may his mother's insistence on cooperation in the kinds of things that T.D. thinks a man should never do -- cleaning, tidying, and other housework.

K.M., on the other hand, feels almost completely bested by the patently stronger appeal of his younger sister, who seems to be preferred by both his mother and father. Added to his lack of physical endowment, this makes a heavy burden -- apparently too heavy for him to bear well.

In summary, the implications of the available data are at once encouraging and discouraging. On the positive side we may note the examples of flexible, comfortable, well-balanced implementation of male roles we have found. It is comforting to know that this kind of development is possible even with current socialization techniques. We are also encouraged by the fact that it is apparently feasible to identify some of the child-handling practices that seem to produce unhealthy attitudes in this area. What we can identify, we may be able to change.

On the other hand, the frequency and intensity of cross-sex hostility in our male Ss, their manifest anxiety about their adequacy, and the prevalence in them of marked inflexibility, suggest a dismaying prognosis for their future adjustment in a society where feminine roles are changing rapidly. In addition, the widespread prevalence of the socialization practices which seem to be associated with the difficulties we have described, and the intense anxieties shown by adults concerning possible failures in "maleness" by boys, give us little reason to hope that amelioration of those difficulties will be swift or simple.

SUMMARY

From the interviewers of 41 8- and 11-year old males, four adjustment patterns to the male sex role are apparent. Sources of conflict experienced by these young children are lack of adequate models, extensive supervision by women, conflicting nature of multiple role demands, lack of clear, positive definition of the male sex role in socialization practices, and rigidity of role demands.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Adapted from a paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the Play Schools Association in October, 1958. The investigation referred to here was supported by a research grant, M 959 (C), from the National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service. The author wishes to thank Dr. Frank Hardesty for his critical reading of preliminary drafts of this paper and for helpful suggestions during informal discussions.

[2] Half of the Ss came from professional families and half mainly from the lower middle and working classes. Ss were interviewed individually by one of seven interviewers, whose minimal education was at the master's level. Ss were asked to respond to a variety of pictorial and verbal techniques, which required from six to ten hours to administer. Responses were story endings to unfinished stories, interpretations of pictured situations, and comments as to "sex-type" on a series of pictures depicting common activities. Ss' teachers were also interviewed.

[3] The author identified these configurations by inspection of the protocols and checked her judgment with Dr. Frank Hardesty, who, as Research Associate on the Project, had been intimately involved in planning the collection of data, and who had collected data from at least a third of the Ss.

REFERENCES

1. Beier, E.G., & Ratzeburg, F. The parental identification of male and female college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1953, 48, 569-572.

2. Brown, D.G. Sex-role preference in young children. Psychol. Monogr., 1956, 70, No. 14 (Whole No. 421).

3. Brown, D.G. Inversion and homosexuality. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1958, 28, 424-429.

4. Brown, D.G. Sex-role development in a changing culture. Psychol. Bull., 1958, 54, 232-242.

5. Cava, E.L., & Raush, H.L. Identification and the adolescent boy's perception of his father. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 855-856.

6. Cottrell, L. The adjustment of the individual to his age and sex roles. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1942, 7, 617-620.

7. Department of Mental Hygiene, State of California: Statistical report, year ending June 30, 1955. Sacramento, Calif.: Dept. of Mental Hygiene, 1955.

8. Department of Mental Hygiene, State of New York: 1956 annual report. Albany, N.Y.: Dept. of Mental Hygiene, 1957.

9. Emmerich, W. Young children's discriminations of family roles. Paper read at the Society for Research in Child Development, Bethesda, Md., March, 1959.

10. Emmerich, W. Parental identification in young children. Genet. Psychol. Monogr., in press.

11. Fauls, L.B., & Smith, W.D. Sex-role learning of five-year-olds. J. genet. Psychol., 1956, 89, 105-117.

12. Feinberg, M.R., Smith, M., & Schmidt, R. An analysis of expressions used by adolescents at varying economic levels to describe accepted and rejected peers. J. genet. Psychol., 1958, 93, 133-148.

13. Frank, L.K. Study of changing sex-roles. Paper read at symposium, Psychological Implications of Changing Sex-Roles. Amer. Psychol. Ass., New York, Sept., 1958.

14. Gilbert, G.M. A survey of "referral problems: in metropolitan child guidance centers. J. clin. Psychol., 1957, 13, 37-40.

15. Goodenough, E.W. Interest in persons as an aspect of sex difference in the early years. Genet. Psychol. Monogr., 1957, 55, 287-323.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

16. Gowan, J.C. The underachieving gifted child, a problem for everyone. *Except. Child*, 1955, *21*, 247-249; 270-271.

17. Gray, S.W. Masculinity-femininity in relation to anxiety and social acceptance. *Child Developm.*, 1957, *28*, 204-214.

18. Gray, S.W., & Klaus, R. The assessment of parental identification. Genet. *Psychol. Monogr.*, 1956, *54*, 87-109.

19. Hacker, H.M. The new burdens of masculinity. *Marriage Fam. Living*, 1957, *19*, 227-233.

20. Hamburger, C. The desire for change of sex as shown by personal letters from 465 men and women. *Acta Endocrinologica*, 1953, *14*, 361-375.

21. Lazowick, L.M. On the nature of identification. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1955, *51*, 175-183.

22. MacDonald, M.W. Criminally aggressive behavior in passive effeminate boys. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1938, *8*, 70-78.

23. Meltzer, H. Sex differences in parental preference patterns. *Char. & Pers.*, 1941, *10*, 114-128.

24. Meltzer, H. Sex differences in children's attitudes to parents. *J. genet. Psychol.*, 1943, *62*, 311-326.

25. Mowrer, O.H. *Learning theory and personality dynamics*. New York: Ronald, 1950.

26. Mussen, P.H., & Payne, D.E. Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1956, *52*, 358-362.

27. Nimkoff, M.F. The child's preference for father or mother. *Amer. social. Rev.*, 1942, *7*, 517-524.

28. Parsons, T. Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. *Amer. social. Rev.*, 1942, *7*, 604-616.

29. *Patients in mental institutions, 1955*: Part II. *Public hospitals for mentally ill*. Public Health Service Publication No. 574. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1956.

30. *Patients in mental institutions, 1955*: Part III. *Private hospitals for the mentally ill and general hospitals with psychiatric facilities*. Public Health Service Publication No. 574. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1956.

31. Pope, B. Socio-economic contrasts in children's peer culture prestige values. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, 1953, *48*, 157-220.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

32. Rabban, M. Sex-role identification in young children in two diverse social groups. Genet. Psychol. Monogr., 1950, 42, 81-158.

33. Roff, M. Intra-family resemblances in personality characteristics. J. Psychol., 1950, 30, 199-227.

34. Ronge, P.H. The feminine protest. Amer. J. indiv. Psychol., 1956, 2, 112-115.

35. Schoeppe, A. Sex differences in adolescent socialization. J. soc. Psychol., 1953, 38, 175-185.

36. Schwartz, E.F. Statistics of juvenile delinquency in the United States. Ann. Amer. Acadm. polit. soc. Sci., January, 1949.

37. Symonds. P.M. The dynamics of human adjustment. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946.

38. Tuddenham, R.D. Studies in reputation: III. Correlates of popularity among elementary-school children. J. educ. Psychol., 1951, 42, 257-276.

39. Tuddenham, R.D. Studies in reputation: I. Sex and grade differences in school children's evaluation of their peers. II. The diagnosis of social adjustment. Psychol. Monogr., 1952, 66, No. 1 (Whole No. 333).

40. Ullman, C.A. Identification of maladjusted school children. Public Health Monograph No. 7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1957.

SEX-ROLE SOCIALIZATION IN SCHOOLS

Betty Levy

Recent critics of the schools have explored the contradiction between what schools *say* they do and what they *actually* do. The ostensible purpose of schools is to educate everyone and to equalize opportunity for all. Liberal reformers who accept this purpose at face value bemoan the fact that schools are "failing" (i.e., not educating), whereas more sophisticated analysts move beyond the stated purpose of school and reveal that school are "succeeding" in differentially socializing pupils by race, class, and sex. These socializing functions are all the more powerful when one considers that they occur despite efforts of many well-intentioned educators to achieve the schools' stated aims.

Illich, Friedenberg, Holt and others have described how the institutional demands of schools (passively "being taught," acquiescing to imposed rules and routines, and so on) conflict with learning and individual development goals. Wasserman, Reimer, Freire, Rothstein, Jencks and others have discussed the role schools play in perpetuating existing social and economic inequalities. Schools may not "make a difference" in the sense that they do not dramatically improve the life chances of the poor, of minority groups, or of women, but they do "make a difference" in that they remain an effective instrument of social control. Schools, after all, were not created to change society, but to maintain it and thus help keep existing dominant groups dominant.

What most critics have failed to examine is how traditional demands of schools function to perpetuate traditional sex roles. For girls, the school's expectations and the traditional sex-role expectations are congruent and provide a strong double-barreled message reinforcing girls' obedience, docility and dependence. For boys, the schools' expectations often conflict with traditional sex-role expectations, resulting in a confusing double message: be aggressive, active, achieving, and independent (be masculine), but also be passive, quite, and conforming (be a *good* pupil).

As a result, boys tend to be more acting-out in school and more noticeable, whereas girls tend to be more completely socialized into "goodness" and thus more easily ignored. The long-lasting result is potentially more positive for boys, since the "masculine" characteristics are related to intellectual development and self-actualization, whereas the strong, consistent pressures on girls to be "feminine" and "good pupils" promote characteristics that inhibit achievement and suppress females' full development.

Recent discussions of sex-role socialization in schools have been dominated by concern for boys who, it is contended, are forced to meet feminine standards of behavior and thinking by the overwhelmingly feminine atmosphere of the elementary school. Because the emphasis has been on boys' problems, the situation of girls has been overlooked. As a result, the schools' "feminization" or "domestication" training is seen, by implication, as good preparing for "real womanhood." The fact that girls are being doubly trained--at home and at school--to be docile and conforming is not of concern. What is of concern is that boys might be treated badly in school, that is, "like girls." The fact that the school as an institution demands conformity and obedience for most children is not noted. Rather, female teachers are labeled "the enemy" in the destruction of male minds!

An incredibly large number of studies have been addressed to the question, "Do female teachers discriminate against boys?" The results of these indicate that boys, far from being discriminated against, provide more intense stimuli for teachers and receive more positive as well as more negative attention from teachers than do girls. Teachers may yell at boys more, but teachers also give them more praise, more instruction, and more encouragement to be creative than they give girls. Girls are either ignored or rewarded merely for following directions and for doing assigned work.

Many studies have demonstrated that boys make up the majority of teachers' behavioral problems and that teachers tend to discipline boys more harshly than girls. In Psychology of Women: A study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts, Judith M. Bardwick speculates that a boy learns in school that he can get attention and respect from his teacher and his peers for nonconforming behavior. Thus, teacher criticism, a seemingly negative response, may actually lead boys toward greater independence, autonomy and activity.

A boy whom the teacher harshly reprimands may temporarily feel put down but may also learn to defend and assert himself more as an independent being. The girl who is softly told she "did something bad" while the teacher gives her a reassuring (patronizing?) pat is less likely to develop self-assertive behavior that carries the risk of disapproval.

Moreover, research done by R. L. Spaulding indicates that a disproportionate number of teachers' negative remarks to girls concerned incorrect answers ("You're wrong, Sally"), a pattern that could only reinforce girls' sense of inferiority.

Other evidence indicates that even by the preschool years, boys tend to be more realistic about their achievements than do girls. Perhaps the criticism boys receive tends to be more task-oriented, helping them to better evaluate their skills. Girls may be receiving more general and more personal criticism leading to an oversensitivity to criticism and a tendency to do tasks to gain social approval rather than to meet one's own standards.

In my opinion, we need more unbiased research to determine differences in how teachers discipline and criticize boys as opposed to girls and how these differences affect their development. Also, teachers need to become increasingly self-aware of how they may be subtly shaping boys more toward independent achievement and girls more toward dependence and nonsustained achievement.

Also, we need to discover if teachers are held more firmly accountable for maintaining order than for facilitating learning. If this is so, it is no wonder that they desire passive, conforming behavior from boys and gratefully receive it from girls.

Schools reinforce traditional sex roles in many ways. One way is through the authority structure of the school itself. Eighty-five percent of all elementary school teachers are women; 79 percent of all elementary school principals are men. Schoolchildren do not need to be taught the differential status of men and women--they learn it simply by attending school.

Another mechanism of sex-role reinforcement is segregated classes and activities. A number of grade schools have been "experimenting" with sex-segregated classes. The all-boy classes emphasize large-muscle physical activity, team games, building, repairing, and other tasks "ordinarily performed by fathers." In one school, the all-girl classes include such activities as "dressing up like mother and playing house."

Even with classes that are not sex-segregated, certain activities, such as cooking and sewing, are encouraged primarily for girls, and other activities, such as woodworking, are encouraged primarily for boys. Physical education and playground activities frequently are sex-segregated. As children move through elementary school, certain subjects, such as English, come to be regarded as "girls' subjects" while other subjects, such as math and science, are perceived as "boys' subjects."

Even in free schools where there is no conscious attempt to sex type, the policy of allowing children to follow their own interests usually results in condoning the pervasive sex-typed activities the children have learned outside the school. Effective open classrooms, while basically noninterventionist, still require children to master basic skills. But intervening to require choices and activities that are free of sex typing has apparently not yet become an important concern of the open classroom.

The separation of boys and girls for seating, hanging up coats, and so on, and the choice of class helpers calls attention to sex distinctions and sex roles. So does sex typing in elementary school reading materials.

The same male-dominated authority structure, sex-segregated courses and programs, and sex typing in textbooks is also found at the secondary school level. In addition, some research findings indicate that counselors guide female students into "feminine" occupations and tend to assume girls desire marriage more than they in fact do. According to a 1971 Report on Sex Bias in the Public Schools by the New York City Chapter of the National Organization for Women, New York City has more boys' than girls' high schools and more restricted programs and more restricted course offerings for girls in both girls' and coeducational high schools. The Report also states that two of the four specialized academic high schools only recently began to admit girls and that innovation occurred only after a court battle.

Teacher's attitudes supplement and reinforce the institutional sexism of high schools. A recent exploratory study of the sex-role attitudes of secondary school teachers in and around New York City indicated that most of them differentiated ideal behaviors by sex. They wanted adolescent males to be dominant, independent and assertive, and adolescent females to be submissive, dependent, unassertive, emotional and concerned about their appearance. Also, in response to a statement about a "competent student interested in math and science," teachers indicated they would encourage a boy to build on that interest but be concerned that a girl develop competencies in the areas besides mathematics and science to avoid becoming lopsided.

Despite the respondents' claims that they treated all students fairly and equally, differential evaluation according to sex-role stereotypes was evident. (These responses should not be interpreted as conscious malevolence on the part of teachers, but rather as an indication that teachers share in the unconscious sex-role ideology that affects us all.)

What can educators do to challenge and correct the detrimental effects of sex-role socialization in schools?

First, they must realize that schools mirror the elitism, racism and sexism of our society. Thus, efforts to challenge sexism in schools must be perceived as part of a larger and long-range struggle to change the inequalities which schools maintain and perpetuate.

Issues which will benefit all men and women, not merely a privileged few, should have the highest priority. For example, struggles to end tracking are more basic than struggles to get a few more female students in the honors track, and attempts to open up the school authority and decision-making structure to all those groups affected by it are more basic than attempts to get a few more female principals. Efforts to rid schools of sexist attitudes and practices must be linked with broader efforts if all are to be successful.

Second, since sex-role stereotypes are so pervasive, an individual teacher may find it helpful to work with other teachers in consciousness-raising groups and sex-role committees to better understand and struggle with the ways we are oppressed by (and oppress our students with) sexist ideas and behavior. In addition to collective efforts to change classroom practices, teachers should form schoolwide committees to focus on curricular programs and materials; challenge sex-segregated classes and activities; and gather data on hiring and promotion practices, salaries and so on.

Some resources for teachers and others wishing to do work in this area are listed below:

1. Little Miss Muffett Fights Back (a bibliography of nonsexist books about girls). Feminists on Children's Media, P.O. Box 4315, Grand Central Station, New York 10017.

2. *Let Them Aspire!* (report on Ann Arbor schools). Contact Marcia Federbush, 1000 Cedar Bend Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105.
3. Lollipop Power, P.O. Box 1171, Chapel Hill, NC 27514. (This organization publishes sex-role free books for young children.)
4. Report on Sex Bias in the Public Schools, New York City Chapter, National Organization for Women, 28 East 56th Street, New York 10022.
5. *Scholastic Teacher*. "Resources for Women's Studies." Jr./Sr. High Teachers Edition, p. 12. "Exploding the Fairy Princess and Other Myths." Elementary Teachers Edition, p. 11. November 1971.
6. "Sexism in the Schools: Focus on the Woman Teacher." *No More Teachers' Dirty Looks*. Vol. III, No. 1. 1972. BARTOC (Bay Area Radical Teachers' Organizing Collective), P.O. Box 40143, San Francisco, CA 94140.
7. Zimmerman, Bonnie B., ed. *Jack and Jill: This is the world that Jack built and Jill came tumbling after . . .* (manual for teachers). P.O. Box 405, Livermore, CA 94550.

THE PYGMALION EFFECT LIVES

Robert Rosenthal

Pygmalion created Galatea out of ivory and desire. In Ovid's account, Pygmalion fell in love with his own sculpture of the perfect woman, and Venus, who spent a lot of time granting requests in those days, gave life to Galatea. In George Bernard Shaw's version 19 centuries later, Henry Higgins turns a Cockney flower girl into an elegant lady, relying on language rather than love.

Most of us do not have Pygmalion's power to manufacture the ideal mate, nor do we all share Higgins' fondness for phonetics. But we may have an extraordinary influence, of which we are often oblivious, on others. Psychologists have not yet learned how to produce Galatea or her male equivalent in the laboratory, but they have demonstrated that the power of expectation alone can influence the behavior of others. The phenomenon has come to be called self-fulfilling prophecy: people sometimes become what we prophesy for them.

This point has long been argued on an intuitive basis. It is obvious, for example, that ghetto children, whose academic performance worsens the longer they remain in school, tend to have teachers who are convinced that the children cannot learn. However, one could argue that teachers expected little because the students behave poorly, rather than the other way around. To see which comes first, the expectation or the performance, we turned to the laboratory.

In the first study of this problem, over a decade ago, Kermit Fode and I asked 10 students to be "experimenters." We gave each experimenter, in turn, about 20 subjects. The experimenter showed each of his subjects a series of faces, which the subject rated on "degree of success or failure" from +10 to -10. We had previously selected photos that most people consider quite neutral.

We gave our experimenters identical instructions on how to administer the test, with one exception. We told half of them that the "well-established" finding was that the subjects would rate the photos positively; we told the rest that subjects would probably rate the photos negatively.

Expectant Voices. In spite of the fact that all experimenters read the same instructions to their subjects, we found that they still managed to convey their expectations. Experimenters who anticipated positive photo ratings got them, while those who expected negative ratings got them too. How did the experimenters silently let their subjects know what they wanted? John Adair and Joyce Epstein repeated this experiment and tape-recorded the experimenters reading the instructions. They got the same results we did, and then repeated their experiment, this time using only the tape recordings of their experimenters to instruct their new sample of subjects. They found that subjects exposed only to these tape recordings were just as much influenced by their experimenter's expectations as were those subjects who had experienced "live" experimenters. Apparently, tone of voice alone did the trick.

Such results generated a spate of studies. Larry Larrabee and L. Dennis Kleinsasser found that experimenters could raise the IQ scores of children, especially on the verbal and information subtests, merely by expecting them to do well. Samuel Marwit found that patients will interpret Rorschach inkblots as animals or human beings, depending on what the examiner has been led to expect. And Ronald Johnson, in an ingenious and carefully controlled study, found that experimenters could improve their subjects' performance on a task requiring subjects to drop as many marbles as possible through one of several holes in the table top by expecting them to do well.

Self-fulfilling prophecies even work for animals. Bertrand Russell, who had something to say about nearly everything, noticed that rats display the "national characteristics of the observer. Animals studied by Americans rush about frantically, with an incredible display of hustle and pep, and at last achieve the desired result by chance. Animals observed by Germans sit still and think, and at last evolve the solution out of their inner consciousness."

Fondling Smart Rats. Russell was not far off. Fode and I told a class of 12 students that one could produce a strain of intelligent rats by inbreeding them to increase their ability to run mazes quickly. To demonstrate, we gave each student five rats, which had to learn to run to the darker of two arms of a T-maze. We told half of our student-experimenters that they had the "mazebright," intelligent rats, we told the rest that they had the stupid rats. Naturally, there was no real difference among any of the animals.

But they certainly differed in their performance. The rats believed to be bright improved daily in running the maze -- they ran faster and more accurately -- while the supposedly dull animals did poorly. The "dumb" rats refused to budge from the starting point 29 percent of the time, while the "smart" rats were recalcitrant only 11 percent of the time.

Then we asked our students to rate the rats and to describe their own attitudes toward them. Those who believed they were working with intelligent animals liked them better and found them more pleasant. Such students said they felt more relaxed with the animals, they treated them more gently and were more enthusiastic about the experiment than students who thought they had dull rats to work with. Curiously, the students with "bright" rats said that they handled them more but talked to them less. One wonders what students with "dull" rats were saying to those poor creatures.

If rats act smarter because their experimenters think they are smarter, we reasoned, perhaps the same phenomenon was at work in the classroom. So in the mid-1960's Lenore Jacobson and I launched what was to become a most controversial study.

Intellectual Bloomers. We selected an elementary school in a lower-class neighborhood and gave all the children a nonverbal IQ test at the beginning of the school year. We disguised the test as one that would predict "intellectual blooming." There were 18 classrooms in the school, three at each of the six grade levels. The three rooms for each grade consisted of children with above-average ability, average ability, and below-average ability.

After the test, we randomly chose 20 percent of the children in each room, and labeled them "intellectual bloomers." We then gave each teacher the names of these children, who, we explained, could be expected to show remarkable gains during the coming year on the basis of their test scores. In fact, the difference between these experimental children and the control group was solely in the teacher's mind.

Our IQ measure required no speaking, reading, or writing. One part of it, a picture vocabulary, did require a greater comprehension of English, so we called it the verbal subtest. The second part required less ability to understand language but more ability to reason abstractly, so we called it the reasoning subtest.

We retested all the children eight months later. For the school as a whole, we found that the experimental children, those whose teachers had been led to expect "blooming," showed an excess in overall IQ gain of four points over the IQ gain of the control children. Their excess in gain was smaller in verbal ability, two points only, but substantially greater in reasoning, where they gained seven points more than the controls. Moreover, it made no difference whether the child was in a high-ability or low-ability classroom. The teachers' expectations benefited children at all levels. The supposed bloomers blossomed, at least modestly.

This experiment, and the book we wrote based on it, met with vigorous criticism. Professor Arthur Jensen of UC, Berkeley, for example, offered three basic arguments.

First, said Jensen, we should have compared classrooms rather than individual children, and this would have produced only negligible IQ changes. But Jensen ignored the fact that we had done that analysis, and that it led to even larger effects than the per-child comparisons.

Second, Jensen objected to the fact that we used the same IQ test twice. The children were familiar with the test when they took it again, he said, so their scores might have improved for that reason. However, Jensen must then explain why the experimental children showed more of these "practice effects" than the control children, who also took the test twice.

Finally, Jensen did not think that the teachers themselves should have given the tests. However, we had already accounted for this problem by having people who knew nothing of the experiment retest the children. The effects of the teachers' expectations actually increased.

R.L. Thorndike added another objection, namely that our IQ test was an unreliable measure, especially for the youngest children, and that any inference based on such a test would be invalid. I do not think that our test was as worthless as Thorndike implies, but even if it was seriously unreliable we are still left with the basic question. Why did the experimental children improve significantly? An unreliable measure would make it harder to find differences between the two groups, not easier.

The most ambitious critique of our Pygmalion in the classroom work was a book by Janet Elashoff and Richard Snow, who completely reanalyzed our original data. They could not disprove the fact that the experimental children did gain more IQ points than control children, even though they transformed our original IQ measure into eight different forms, some of which were biased statistically to minimize any effects of teachers' expectations.

The debate continued, and so did the research. Others sought to discover the Pygmalion effect, and not everyone was successful, which contributed to the controversy. By now 242 studies have been done, with all sorts of subjects and situations. Of these, 84 found that prophecies, i.e., the experimenters' or teachers' expectations, made a significant difference.

But we must not reject the theory because "only" 84 studies support it; on the contrary. According to the rules of statistical significance, we could expect five percent of those 242 studies (about 12) to have come out as predicted just by chance. The fact that we have 84, seven times more than chance would dictate, means that the Pygmalion effect does exist in certain circumstances. Moreover, it is not limited to young children and rats; adolescents and adults are affected too.

Outside the Lab. And the Pygmalion effect is as likely to occur in the real world as in the experimenter's tower. Of the 242 studies that have been done to date, 57 took place outside the laboratory -- in a classroom, a factory, an office and the like. The proportion of significant results is about the same for experiments conducted in the field as in the laboratory, some 37 percent for the field and 34 percent for the laboratory.

For example, Randy Burnham and Donald Hartsough found Pygmalion in the swimming pool. Their subjects were boys and girls, ages seven to 14, who were learning to swim at a summer camp. Half of the instructors were led to think that they were dealing with a "high-potential" group, and their students became better swimmers, by the end of their two-week camping period, than the regular group. And another team of researchers found that it took only two weeks for teen-age girls, who were institutionalized for various offenses, to show a marked improvement in their classroom behavior when they had been labeled "potential bloomers."

Even the United States Air Force Academy Preparatory School succumbed. W.R. Schrank randomly assigned 100 enlisted airmen to one of five math classes, and he told the teachers that each class contained students selected for different levels of ability. The boys in the supposed high-ability classes improved their math scores substantially.

J. Michael Palardy tested the popular assumption that boys have a tougher time learning to read than girls. First-grade teachers are well aware of this folk belief, and thus have clear expectations when they give reading lessons. Palardy surveyed 63 teachers and found five who believed that boys could learn to read as well as girls in the first-grade. He matched these five on a number of factors -- background, teaching methods, etc. -- with five who believed in the stereotype. Indeed, teachers who expected to discover sex differences in reading ability found them. But the boys did just as well as the girls when their teachers thought they would. (As a foot-note to this study, the "well-known" sex difference in learning to read also tends to disappear when the children learn from teaching machines rather than from teachers.)

Albert King moved the Pygmalion paradigm into the work world with an ingenious set of five experiments. King was interested in the effects of supervisor expectations on the job performance of disadvantaged workers (unemployed or underemployed, mostly black and members of other minorities). In three of his studies the workers were women in training to become nurses' aides, presser-machine operators, or assemblers of electronic equipment. In the other two studies, the workers were men who were learning to become auto mechanics or welders.

In each experiment, King randomly picked the names of some of the trainees, and told the supervisors that these workers showed a special potential for their particular job. King collected several measures of the workers' performances: objective tests, peer ratings, absences and so on. (King ignored the supervisors' ratings of trainees, since these might reflect only their perception and not actual changes in their performance.) The Pygmalion effect worked in four of the five experiments -- for every group of trainees but the nurses' aides. Trainees whose supervisors had expected high job performance of them did much better than the control groups. However, the effect was especially marked among male workers, the welders and mechanics, and less so among female workers, the pressers and assemblers. Perhaps the supervisors found it harder to accept the idea that women could have "special potential" for their work.

All of this research supported our feeling that self-fulfilling prophecy is a real phenomenon, that it occurs both in and out of the classroom and the laboratory. The next step was to figure out what subtle forces are going on in the exchange between teacher and learner. What makes average kids increase their IQ, neophytes swim better, and trainees learn faster? How does A communicate his or her expectations to B, especially when both A and B probably are unaware of the process?

Average Performance Ranks (Lower Ranks indicate Superior Performance):

Study	Control group	Experimental group
1 welders	9.9	3.6
2 mechanics	10.7	4.3
3 pressers	9.2	5.3
4 assemblers	11.3	7.8
5 nurses' aides	9.2	8.3

Explaining the Pygmalion Effect. The current evidence leads me to propose a four-factor "theory" of the influences that produce the Pygmalion effect. People who have been led to expect good things from their students, children, clients or what-have-you appear to:

- create a warmer social-emotional mood around their "special" students (climate);
- give more feedback to these students about their performance (feedback);
- teach more material and more difficult material to their special students (input);
- give their special students more opportunities to respond and question (output).

There is nothing magical or definitive about the choice of these four, and, in fact, none of them is independent of the others. My criterion for including each as a factor is that there be at least five studies that support it and that no more than 20 percent of the studies bearing on each factor contradict it.

The Climate Factor. "Climate" apparently has to do with warmth, attention and emotional support. Fourteen studies have investigated this factor, 12 of which came out as predicted. Not all of them dealt with the teacher-student relationship; some took place in industrial and clinical contexts as well.

For example, Geri Alpert told a group of psychiatrists that some of their patients had been specially selected for them on the basis of "therapeutic compatibility." She gave them no expectations about the rest of their patients. Later Alpert asked the patients to describe their therapists and their sessions together. From a patient's eye view, psychiatrists behave more warmly toward people with whom they expect to be compatible and who are likely to get well.

Alan Chaikin, Edward Sigler, and Valerian Derlega asked male and female college undergraduates to teach a short unit on home and family safety to a 12-year-old boy. One third of the "teachers" thought that the boy had an IQ of 130 and did very well in school, one third thought that the child had an IQ of 85 and did poorly in school, and the last third had no information about the boy's IQ. Then the experimenters videotaped the exchange between teachers and student to see what nonverbal cues were going on.

Teachers who thought they were dealing with a bright student were more likely to smile at the boy, nod their heads approvingly, lean toward the boy, and look him in the eye for longer periods. A variety of analogous studies have found that "special-potential" subjects report their teachers or counselors as being more positive, accepting, perceptive, friendly, fond of them, and supportive.

The Feedback Factor. The difference between this factor and the previous one (for both involve warmth and attention) is that feedback depends on a response from the student. A teacher can be generally warm, but still react critically or indifferently to a child's answers or comments. Feedback refers specifically to how much active teaching occurs: often the teacher rewards a desired response, corrects a wrong answer, asks for the student's further thoughts, and so on. Ten studies explored this factor, of which eight supported it.

Jere Brophy and Tom Good asked first grade teachers to name their high and low achievers. The researchers then watched the teachers work with the children. The teachers ignored only three percent of the high achievers' answers but they ignored 15 percent of the low achievers' answers. The good students, then, get more feedback, whether their responses are right or wrong.

Teachers give more feedback to apt undergraduates as well as to apt first graders. John Lanzetta and T.E. Hannah offered college students the chance to play teacher, and gave them the choice of five kinds of feedback for use in teaching a concept task: a strong electric shock, a mild shock, a neutral light, a small amount of money, and a larger amount of money. The "learner," who was a confederate of the experimenters, gave 36 correct and 84 incorrect answers in all cases.

When the student teachers thought the learner had a "high potential," they rewarded him with the larger sum of money when he was right, and shocked him more severely when he was wrong. When they thought that the learner has a "low learning potential," however, they gave him the lesser reward or punishment. In other words, teachers send clearer, stronger evaluations to students for whom they have greater expectations.

But another experiment found that children believed to be bright got more praise, but not more criticism; criticism was reserved for children believed to be dull. Yet a third study found that supposedly "gifted" children get more praise from their teachers, but found no difference between "gifted" and "regular" children in the criticism they got. The matter is complicated. Perhaps criticism for a wrong answer needs to be accompanied by enough praise and support on other occasions; otherwise the student may see the teacher as overly critical and cold. We can say with modest certainty that praise is a factor in achieving the Pygmalion effect, but the role of criticism is less clear.

The Input Factor. There are only five studies that directly deal with this factor, but all five find that teachers literally teach more to children of whom they expect more.

The most dramatic case in point is W. Victor Beez's work with 60 preschoolers and 60 teachers in a Headstart program. Beez told half of the teachers that they could expect poor performance from their supposedly "below-average" children; the rest expected exceptional performance from their "bright" children. Observers, who had not been told what the teachers' expectations were, noted the exchanges between teacher and child. The teachers worked much harder when they believed they had a bright child. In a unit on word learning for example, 87 percent of the teachers of "bright" children taught eight or more words, but only 13 percent of the teachers of the "dull" children tried to teach them that many. Not surprisingly, 77 percent of the "bright" children learned five or more words, but only 13 percent of the "dull" children learned that many.

Number of words taught:	Teacher's expectation: dull children	Teacher's expectation: bright children
11 or more	0	14
9 or 10	1	10
7 or 8	7	3
5 or 6	15	1
4 or less	7	2
	30	30

Such results tell us that a teacher's expectations about a student's performance are not simply transmitted in subtle voice nuances and a casual facial expression. The expectations may be translated into explicit, overt alterations in teaching style and substance.

The Output Factor. Eleven studies out of 12 done support this factor, indicating that teachers encourage greater responsiveness from students of whom they expect more. They call on such students more often, ask them harder questions, give them more time to answer, and prompt them toward the correct answer. Output is therefore closely related to feedback.

Mary Budd Rowe gives us a good example. She was interested in how long teachers wait for an answer to their question before going on to the next child. She found that many experienced teachers wait only one second before they ask the question again, often of someone else. However, Rowe found that teachers wait longer for the students whom they believe to be bright. When Rowe pointed this out to the teachers involved, they reacted with surprise and insight. "I guess we don't expect an answer (of the poor students)," said one, "so we go on to someone else." When these same teachers then deliberately increased their waiting time for their "slower" students, they got increased responsiveness.

Jeffrey Hersh's work illustrates another facet of the output factor. He asked graduate students to administer the Stanford-Binet IQ Test to children in a Headstart program. Examiners who had been told the children had high intellectual ability immediately began with more difficult questions. They demanded more of the children, and got more.

An Unexpected Galatea. We knew from our original Pygmalion experiment in the classroom that favorable expectations could have a beneficial effect. At the end of the year the teachers had all sorts of good things to say about the "intellectual bloomers": they had a better chance of being successful in the future, said the teachers, they were more appealing, better adjusted, more affectionate and autonomous. So the teachers perceived them, in any case.

We thought that perhaps it was because the experimental children gained more in IQ that the teachers rated their behavior and aptitudes more highly. So we looked at the control-group children who had also gained in IQ that year, to see whether the teachers liked them as much as the bloomers. Such was not the case. To our astonishment, the more the control students increased in IQ, the less well adjusted, interesting and affectionate the teachers thought them.

It seems, then, that when a child who is not expected to do well does so, his teacher looks upon his or her behavior and personality as undesirable. This was especially true, we discovered, for children in low-ability classrooms. Teachers may have a difficult time thinking that a child who has a low-ability label can show an intellectual spurt. They may interpret this change as "maladjustment" or "troublemaking." Perhaps the child doesn't know his or her place. Several subsequent experiments confirmed this finding, so the hazards of unpredicted success are likely to be real rather than a freak of one study. Alfred Shore, for example, asked teachers to predict their students' intellectual achievement and to describe their students' classroom behavior. A month later, Shore gave the teachers the students' real IQ scores and asked for a reappraisal. Again, teachers downgraded those students in personality and adjustment who had done "too well" — i.e., contrary to their expectations.

Eleanor Leacock studied four schools in four neighborhoods, two poor and two middle-income. Within each income level one school was essentially all black and the other essentially white. Leacock interviewed the fifth-grade teachers about their feelings for the children, and scored their comments for positive, neutral, or negative feelings and attitudes.

Double Handicap. Leacock found that the teachers were much less favorable to the lower-class children than they were to the middle-class children; 40 percent of their comments about the poorer children were negative, compared to 20 percent of their comments about the middle-class children. And the teachers were even more likely to talk negatively about black children than white children: 43 percent to 17 percent.

Leacock then went on to relate the children's IQ scores to the teachers' feelings toward them. IQ scores of the middle-income children, both black and white, were clearly related to the positive attitudes of their teachers. This relationship did not hold for the low-income children; in fact, it was reversed. That is, lower-income children who had higher IQs tended to have teachers who viewed them negatively, and this was especially true for lower-income children who were black. The children who surpassed their teachers' expectations got resentment and complaints for their pains.

Thus children who are both black and lower-income have a double handicap. And this result cannot be attributed to white teachers' bias: both of the teachers of the black children were themselves black. The prejudice of stunted expectations knows no race barrier.

We still do not know exactly how the Pygmalion effect works. But we know that often it does work, and that it has powers that can hinder as well as help the development of others. Field and experimental studies are beginning to isolate the factors that will give some insight into the process. Such awareness may help some to create their Galateas, but it will also give the Galateas a chance to fight back.

CINDERELLA DOESN'T LIVE HERE ANYMORE

Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

Two thirds of all secondary vocational students are girls. The majority--55.5 percent--of all students in secondary, postsecondary and adult vocational education are girls and women. And what is happening to the majority of vocational education students? It seems they are being better prepared for Cinderellahood than for jobs.

Cinderella, you may remember, was expected to do the cooking and cleaning and to do it well. She was also much admired for looking beautiful and maintaining a manner of grace and charm while carrying out her duties under the most difficult of circumstances.

When she was miraculously discovered by the Prince and went with him to live in the castle, we feel fairly certain that she did not take up an outside career of castle building or working in the sword repair shop in town. Rather, she remained in the Cinderella-intensive spheres of non-gainful castle economics where she was kept very busy with the enormous responsibility of seeing to the food, housing, clothing, and herbal needs of perhaps over 100 persons. She also suffered the emotional and physical drain of looking after her own family, which increased at the approximate rate of one a year.

The Prince, of course, never abandoned her (except for occasional trips to Crusader conventions) because that would have meant abandoning his castle, and there weren't too many other castles around where he could get a job as Prince without a lot of bloodshed. They never got divorced because that wasn't allowed. If things got too bad, she occasionally went to live in the convent, where she continued her female intensive work in an aura of sanctity. Usually, however, the Prince and Cinderella lived happily ever after--which wasn't really so hard to do because most people of the time tended to be dead by the time they were 35.

In many ways, the country's federally supported vocational education programs are preparing the female enrollees for Cinderella's lifestyle. . . .

Of all young women enrolled in federally authorized vocational education, 49.2 percent are in home economics, but only 2.4 percent of all home economics enrollees are in training for gainful employment. The remainder are in programs designed to provide preparation for homemaking, not to offer training for work outside the home.

Unromantic Realities

Another 29 percent of vocational education's female enrollees are in female-intensive clerical fields, jobs that seldom offer high pay or promising career ladders. These statistics suggest that at least three-quarters of vocational education's female enrollees are preparing for Cinderellahood or for "something to do" while waiting for the Prince.

But, you may say, what's wrong with that? Most girls are going to get married and become mothers anyway. Why not prepare them to care for a prince and children rather than pushing them into the "rat race" that has given men twice the ulcers of women and sent them to early graves? What's so terrible about expecting girls to grow up to be happily married, to take care of happy, healthy children, and to depend on their husbands to take care of their financial needs?

The answer to all these questions is that today's girls will face an adult reality that is dramatically at variance with the Cinderella myth. Figures from the Department of Labor's Women's Bureau and other governmental agencies show that:

- 53.9 percent of all women over the age of 18 are in the work force
- even if a woman marries, she can expect to work for 25 years
- 13 million women with children are in the labor force
- 1 out of every 8 families is headed by a woman
- 1 out of 5 black families is headed by a woman
- 2 out of 3 poor black families are headed by women
- the divorce rate is up 109 percent since 1962 and rising
- child support by fathers in divided families is nearly nonexistent
- the majority of old people who are poor are women

These facts clearly document the need for girls to prepare for lives vastly different from Cinderella's. And vocational education, it would seem, is an excellent channel for offering such preparation.

As already noted, the great majority of girls in vocational education are enrolled in female intensive programs. And according to Women in Vocational Education, these traditional programs dominated by females offer training for over 33 different occupations, while fields in which males predominate offer 95 job training options. Moreover, vocational areas in which girls are in the majority have a higher ratio of students to teachers than do areas in which most students are male.

Differential treatment on the basis of sex in educational programs receiving Federal funds is explicitly forbidden by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Yet, various reports, studies and congressional hearings document that unequal treatment is still pervasive in vocational education.

The long-range danger of sex-role stereotyping is that it provides the foundation on which institutionalized sex discrimination has been--and, in some cases, continues to be--built. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 makes it illegal to bar one sex from vocational education schools or programs or to set up separate shop or home economics classes for boys or girls. The law also requires single-sex institutions to submit plans for eliminating admissions barriers for the other sex. However, these requirements have not yet been fully implemented. For example, Compliance Enforcement in Area Vocational Education Schools, a

May 1974 paper published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office for Civil Rights, states:

> "By law . . . a single-sex institution is in noncompliance right now if it's not eliminating admissions barriers according to plan. And according to Title IX, the plan was to have been submitted and approved by June 4, 1973. So far, no plans have been approved."

As of September 1975, this count had not increased . . . .

Tell It Like It Is

Among vocational educators who are concerned with educational equity, two problems are often cited as roadblocks to fair vocational development for girls. One roadblock, they say, sits at the beginning of training, and the other awaits at the end. Girls, it is reiterated, simply have not enrolled and will not enroll in nontraditional programs because of societal and parental pressures.

But that is begging the question. Vocational educators can address this problem by:

- informing parents, students and community members of the reasons for girls to consider new career alternatives
- informing counselors at junior high schools and other schools that feed into vocational schools of nontraditional vocational training for girls
- presenting programs for students at feeder schools to let them know they are welcome in nontraditional programs and to explain why those programs may be to their long-term advantage
- holding workshops that will help vocational education teachers learn how to encourage girls who are trying to reach nontraditional goals

To simply wait for girls to appear at vocational or technical schools asking for nontraditional enrollment is like the situation a few years back when educators in all-white schools "waited" for black children to seek admission--unasked and unencouraged.

A second problem cited by vocational educators is that employers are not willing to hire women for nontraditional fields so it is useless to train them for new fields. But Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 clearly states that a school cannot allow itself to be used by employers attempting to select employees on a discriminatory basis . . . .

Preparation for Cinderellahood is no longer a long-range vocation for responsible educators to be offering their female students. The glass slipper of sex-stereotyped education is far too fragile for tomorrow's world. Vocational educators need to remove their blinders, just as their colleagues are beginning to do in other educational institutions,

---

and to take a hard look at the kinds of lives for which their students need to be prepared. If they do not, the likelihood is now great that those blinders will run them headlong into time-consuming and damaging sex discrimination suits brought by individuals and organizations concerned with educational equity.

ROLES, LABELS, STEREOTYPES: A COUNSELOR'S CHALLENGE

Barbara Cook

How can a counselor most effectively work with men and women students in helping them find individual identities--sometimes in contradiction to the roles dictated by society?

- What should it mean to the counselor to have an increased awareness of culturally defined roles for men and women?
- How may a counselor increase her or his own awareness?
- How does the counselor's self-concept affect his or her ability to help individual men and women find answers to their individual problems?

A recent survey done at my own institution shows that out of a faculty of 1,429, only 175 are women; 42 percent of our instructors are women; 14 percent of our assistant professors are women; 6.5 percent of our associate professors are women; and 3 percent of our full professors are women--an appalling significant decrease as the ranks become higher. We have six department heads who are women--all in the fields of home economics, nursing, and physical education for women. These are actual figures even though our student population is one-third female.[1]

The national figures show that it takes a female associate professor three times as long on the average to be promoted as it does a male associate professor. Such figures are familiar, so I will concentrate on the methods, techniques and education necessary to prevent their continued occurrence. I quote them only as one small example of the enormous job yet to be done, the wasted talent, the undeveloped aspiration and the way the humanness of both men and women is damaged in our society by sexual stereotyping.

There is no doubt that discriminatory policies as they affect women are receiving a good bit of attention nowadays. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has published guidelines for educational institutions and is insisting upon "positive, affirmative action" to the fair employment of women in terms of representative numbers, opportunities and salaries. Women's organizations, concerned with all facets of women's lives, are proliferating and are beginning to take some affirmative action themselves. Perhaps the most significant quality, however, of most of the women's movements is "that most women's organizations are refusing to make the self-defeating mistake of earlier feminist movements--which focused on the uniqueness of women. More wisely the new women are declaring that they are human beings, equally so with men, and they promise emancipation from stereotyping for both sexes."[2]

In some of the recent literature, both scholarly and militant, the idea of the caste-like status of women and blacks has been given new attention. Helen Hacker first wrote about this in 1951.[3] Her model has been expanded and used by a number of writers to show the conscious or unconscious "rationalization of status"--the ascribed attitudes, the social visibility, the accommodation attitudes, the discriminations. A strong cultural prescription of roles dictates appropriate behavior not only for women and blacks, but also for men, for whites, and even for age groups--most notably the young. This prescription of roles is currently under attack by militant and/or concerned groups. This battle was waged first by the blacks through their acts of civil disobedience in Montgomery, then by the young with their insistence on "participatory democracy"--a giving to ordinary people of a real voice in the decision-making process. Now, finally, women are fighting on many fronts for legal equality as well as for free choice in the self-determination of their individual lives.

All three of these recent movements, occurring in increased strength since 1955, are speaking to the same principle--one that is at the very foundation of the education profession: the right of each individual to attain maximum development. (I am amazed daily that the precepts that student personnel workers have been endorsing since the 1920's have now become so much a part of the liberal-radical movements in educational reform. The real tragedy is that most of us don't even recognize them.) But a new and important dimension has been added to this fundamental concept: the right of each individual to attain maximum development according to his or her abilities, desires, efforts and aspiration, not according to a social or sexual role prescribed by society.

As counselors, we must clearly understand what Robert Blackburn describes as "The Moral Revolution" in the November 1970 AAHE College and and University Bulletin. Blackburn delineates eight new values, six of which are directly related to our subject:[4]

1. Truth has a higher value than loyalty.
2. The individual is more respected than the organization.
3. Human needs have priority over technological concerns.
4. Personal expression is more important than social forms.
5. Openness is replacing secrecy.
6. No longer can a minority group be relegated to second-class citizenship.

In summary, we are moving toward a society where truth, individualism, human needs, personal expression, openness and real opportunity for all will be highly valued.

The Grafton Youth Report, a Madison Avenue publication geared to communications, business, and educational executives talks squarely and sensibly to its subscribers. Its 1969 special report A Set of Guidelines Dealing with Youth offered the following suggestion:

> Remember that the sexes are integrated. Boys and girls today debate as equals, go out campaigning together for their favorite candidates, consult each other without affectation on their common problems. It does not occur to them that females should be addressed in any special way, or spared any knowledge about life. Much has been said about a "sex revolution," but the most important point seems to have been missed: The

> two sexes are friends as they have never been before. Any hint in choice of words or tone of voice that you are putting the female sex down in some way, as not quite the full partners of the male, will date you irrevocably and cause loss of confidence in what you have to say or sell.[5]

The November 1970 issue of that same Grafton report stated that women's liberation is the only youth movement today of any consequence (in both high schools and colleges) identifiable in all sections of the country.[6]

With this background of widespread public awareness of both racial and sexual discrimination, with the emphasis on attacking the societal prescription of roles for all people, and with the real interest being shown by youth in this problem (or at least in the problem of individualization), the counselor and the educator are in unique positions to help release the currents of change and to work more effectively with individuals--both boys and girls, whites and blacks--in offering individualistic alternatives for each person's life-style.

But alternatives for planning or action are only viable if they are realistic choices. Our society has not yet accepted the moral revolution of which Blackburn wrote, nor are all avenues open to all people. Nor are all counselors convinced that the wave of the near future will really allow the kind of individualism discussed here. Our own experience, biases, beliefs--our own historic sense and perceptions--too often show through clearly, if not always brightly. Yet when we work with students we work with the future. Our lockstep system of education too often decides the fate of a potential scientist by assignment of specific courses in the early years of high school. Talent and choice may too often be constrained in a counseling office when engineering is recommended for a bright boy, elementary education for a bright girl. And what of the kids who don't go to college? Elizabeth Koontz, director of the Women's Bureau, tells about the typical young woman who acquires some skill in typing. She may earn $2.50 an hour in some sections, or she may earn $1.65 an hour in other sections, to sit at her desk and type, type, type. But the man who repairs her typewriter earns $8.50 an hour. Sometimes, as counselors, we unwittingly help turn the keys that lock our students into prescribed roles without really giving enough thought to what their world may be like in 10 or 15 years.

Since World War II, sex roles for women have changed drastically. All good women counselors, and happily even some of the men, now know about life planning for women. Many of us can, at the drop of a hat, rattle off the latest Women's Bureau figures about the number of women in the labor force, the woman's age when her last child will be born, the number of years she will work correlated with educational attainment, and so forth. Woman has become the subject.

However, comparatively little has been written about the role of the male. There has been concern expressed in the field of education about female dominance in training of the young, particularly that young boys are not being provided with any meaningful male figures. Some have protested that our society is female dominated, that men in this country grow up to be weak and dependent. Unfortunately much of the literature about male roles resolves these problems by suggesting ways to further emphasize and strengthen the "maleness" stereotype in our society, an emphasis that results inevitably in an "either/or" domination of one sex by the other. The truth is that children, all children, need meaningful male and female role models, role models who are significant human beings in their own right--neither dominated nor domineering. All writers agree, though, that the adult male seeks and finds his identity primarily through his work and secondarily through his family. For the woman, of course, it is the other way around.

However, emerging trends may have a direct relationship to changing sex roles, and we should be aware of these as well. Population control and the ecological balance have become a major source of concern. Kingsley Davis and others have hypothesized that, "given the assumption that population growth in the U.S. should be stopped by reducing the birth rate, efforts should be made to de-emphasize the women's role upon the importance of having children."[7] Since most studies have shown that the concept of the woman's role includes her having and rearing children, and that no matter what career she follows, her most important role is still that of becoming a mother, a serious movement toward population control will necessitate a change in this rather basic and culturally prescribed concept.[8] If anyone thinks that de-emphasizing the centrality of a woman's being a mother and wife will be easy, I urge the reading of Billy Graham's article in the December 1970 Ladies' Home Journal. The Reverend Mr. Graham, backed by appropriate Bible texts, writes that Eve's biological role was to bear children; her romantic role was to love her husband; and her vocational role was to be second in command. He says:

> I believe the women's liberation movement is an echo of our overall philosophy of permissiveness. Everyone young, old, male and female seems bent upon abandoning any moral, Biblical and traditional guidelines. Many women are obviously saying, "Why can't we get in on the act?"[9]

Perhaps in the year 1990, when it is estimated that women will account for 55 percent of the U.S. population (as opposed to 51 percent now), Mr. Graham will be advocating polygamy so that all women can experience the fulfillment of following Eve's prescribed role as the bearer of children.

There are other changes of which we should be aware: the breakdown in traditional concepts of the nuclear family, increasing interest in communal and experimental living forms, and the new California divorce laws which share responsibility and financial arrangements equally between the two marriage partners and which promise to serve as models for other states. All these factors will tend to diminish the security of marriage for the male as well as for the female. Marriage in 1980 or 1985 is very likely to be something quite different from the father and mother held together by the rearing of the young. As this historical family concept continues to change, prescribed sex roles will become much more individualistic.

Counselors need to know both the present reality and the direction of the future if they are to help young people more easily enter a world filled with ever-increasing change and ambiguity. Alice Rossi challenged all counselors when she wrote:

> Hence, it is when men question work, and women question family commitment, and both sexes question an uncritical commitment to nation-state, that we find responses among parents, teachers, employers and government officials ranging from a shiver of distaste to a convulsion of hate. The strange thing is that one hardly ever hears anyone point to precisely these emerging qualities among young people as healthy indicators that promise solutions to precisely the problems all would agree are reaching crisis proportions in the world at large. Virulent nationalism and the consequence of international hositility will not be solved by upping nuclear deterrence by the emergence of supra-national loyalties to the well being of all men and women on earth. The population explosion will not be solved unless more men and women remain unmarried, have fewer children, or none at all. Environmental pollution will not be solved unless we live simply and stop as a nation from consuming more than half the world's raw materials. The technitronic future of increased leisure time will be meaningless unless men and women value that leisure time at least equally as much as their work time.[10]

Second, we must somehow develop a personal objectivity as we look at human needs. Many counselors internalize society's prescribed roles and are comfortable with them. Many professional men and women simply shrug and say "women's liberation doesn't concern me." Many, both men and women, feel threatened by a movement--a moral revolution, if you will--that may upset their security. There are others, unfortunately mostly women, who have been badly treated in their professional life--they have been denied opportunity because of their sex, not because of a lack of talent. They are not promoted or compensated as well, or as quickly, as their male counterparts. They find themselves increasingly uninvolved in significant work. The result of this frustration, as we know from the black movement, is often bitterness and militancy, or self-acceptance of a meaningless life and a concept of one's self as an unperson.

Third, we must fight discrimination on all levels within our own institutions. All of us can think of many examples of such discrimination in our own policies and procedures. At Purdue, for example, a reduction in our activity fee is given to spouses of male students but not to spouses of female students. At many institutions the salary paid is greater for married faculty with families than it is for the single faculty member. Nepotism bans continue in many schools. These are just a few of many stupid, inhuman practices left over from an earlier time. They must cease.

Fourth, we must provide good role models of both sexes--and all races, married and single--for our students. A young man should have as much opportunity to learn about being a male nurse as a young woman has about being a female doctor. We must somehow destroy the occupational myths of maleness and femaleness.

Again, we may learn from the black movement. Just as Little Black Sambo has been attacked because of the stereotyping of a black child, so we should attack children's books that exclusively show Mary playing house and Johnny building a house. Images of appropriate occupations by sex start quite young in a child's life and probably have hurt the young boy even more than the young girl. Because our culture is still male dominated, it is more acceptable for a girl to be a "tomboy" than for a boy to be a "sissy." Although it is not easy for either, it is probably easier for a woman to survive a college engineering course than for a man to survive a college home economics course. We can do some simple but tangible things here. We can examine our institutional literature and make sure pictures of students or faculty show a fair mixture of the sexes in all fields. We can also purge our vocational files of other examples of occupational stereotyping.

Fifth, professional women especially, paving the way for other women, must be more aggressive in defending and expanding their own status. Women must learn to avoid acting in stereotyped kinds of ways: women must learn to act, not only to react; women must learn to take initiative, to speak out, to assume more responsibility as professional people. Myths concerning women as weak, defenseless, and dependent must be destroyed, and women themselves must be willing to fight this battle.

Last, we must simply be good human persons ourselves. Strangely, when I am shaken out of my accustomed nondirective role and allow myself to show frustration, anger, or joy, I reach students a great deal more effectively. They care about seeing us as we are; we must have enough self-confidence to share ourselves with them--not always as a woman, not always as a counselor or a dean, but some of the time just as a normal person reacting with, and to, them the same way.

Ashley Montagu makes my point in a very few sentences:

> Every person embodies an adventure of existence, and the art of life consists in the guidance of this adventure in which men and women must participate equally. The prime business of a democracy, the great democratic task of men and women, is not the making of things, not even the making of money, but the making of human beings. . . .[11]

FOOTNOTES

1. Purdue University, Breakdown of Faculty by Rank and Sex, October 1970.
2. Owens, Louise H. "Toward More Meaningful Counseling with Women." Paper presented at the American Guidance and Personnel Association, March 1970.

3. Hacker, Helen M. "Women as a Minority Group." Social Forces 30: 60-69; 1951.
4. Blackburn, Robert T. "Changes in Faculty Life Styles." AAHE College and University Bulletin, November 1, 1970.
5. Grafton Report. Youth Report: A Set of Guidelines for Dealing with Youth. Special Report, 1969.
6. Grafton Report, November 1970.
7. Davis, Kingsley. "Population Policy: Will Current Programs Succeed?" Science, November 1967. p. 158.
8. Slolka, Susan, and Barnett, Larry D. "Education and Religion as Factors in Women's Attitudes Motivating Childbearing." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31: 740-750; November 1969.
9. Graham, Billy. "Jesus and the Liberated Woman." Ladies Home Journal, December 1970. pp. 42, 44.
10. Rossi, Alice S. "Women in the Seventies: Problems and Possibilities." Barnard Alumnae, Spring 1970, p. 7.
11. Montagu, Ashley. The Natural Superiority of Women. New York: Lancer Books, 1953. p. 177.

A WOMAN'S PLACE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLES PORTRAYED BY WOMEN IN MAGAZINE ADVERTISEMENTS

Alice E. Courtney and Sarah Wernick Lockeretz

Some members of the female liberation movement have criticized the very limited and negative stereotypes of women in advertising [1, 2, 3, 4]. This article reports on an exploratory study that examined print advertisements to see if such stereotypes could be identified. Particular attention was concentrated on comparing the occupational and non-working roles of men and women as portrayed in advertisements.

Methods

Magazines directed toward both male and female readers were analyzed for stereotypes. Seven magazines, published the week of April 18, 1970, were selected: Life, Look, Newsweek, The New Yorker, Saturday Review, Time, and U.S. News and World Report. The April 1970 issue of Reader's Digest was also included. These publications appeal to general audiences and presumably are more likely than specialized magazines to show women in a wide variety of roles.

A record was made of each of a total of 729 advertisements in the magazines sampled. Each was coded by one or more content categories, including product type, the number and sexes of all adults, and their occupations or activities. Children and teenagers were not included. In addition, two ads showing crowd scenes were excluded since it was not possible to count or identify individuals' roles. The analysis was concerned with those 312 ads showing one or more adults.[1] More men (397) than women (278) were pictured in these ads.

Findings

The print advertisements examined very rarely showed women in working roles. About 33% of the full-time workers in the United States are women: however, only 12% of the workers shown in the ads were female. Moreover, if professional entertainers of both sexes are excluded, the proportion of women workers pictured drops to just seven percent. Almost half of the men (45%) were shown in working roles: in contrast, less than one-tenth of the women (9%) were shown in working roles.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the occupations of the working men and women seen in the ads. Of 24 working women, 14 (58%) were entertainers. Not a single woman was shown as a professional or high-level business executive. Aside from entertainers, the working women were: clerks (3), stewardess (1), assembly line worker (1), airline employees engaged in food preparation (3), schoolteacher (1), and one woman identified only as a "working woman."[2]

Three nonworking roles for men and women portrayed in the advertisements were classed as family, recreational, and decorative (that is, nonactive). Table 2 summarized the relationship between the sex composition of the ads and the nonworking roles shown. Men alone were usually pictured in working roles, and only 37% of the men shown alone or with other men were in nonworking roles. However, when women were shown alone or with other women, 90% were in nonworking roles. Of these, 70% were in the nonactive, decorative role.

Table 1

Occupations of Working Men and Women
Shown in Advertisements[a]

	Percent of males	Percent of females
Proportion shown as workers	45	9
Occupational categories		
High-level business executives	10	0
Professional	9	0
Entertainers, professional sports	20	58
Sales, middle-level business, semi-professional	7	8
Nonprofessional white collar	2	17
Blue collar	40	17
Soldiers, police	12	0
	100	100
Number of workers shown	176	24

[a] Based on number of adults shown

When men appeared in ads with women, they were far less likely to be working than when alone or with other men. Of men depicted alone or with other men, 63% were working, compared to only 29% of the men shown with women. When men and women were pictured together, about half the time they were in recreational roles.

Differences in male and female roles portrayed were also evident in the number of males and females and the type of product advertised. Table 3 shows a division of the male and female "worlds" by product category.

These 16 product categories represent a broad segment of American life, in which women were shown operating independently in only a limited way: they took care of themselves and their homes. For major household buying decisions--applicances, furniture--advertisements showed the woman joined by the man.

In the advertisements studied, women rarely ventured far from the home by themselves or with other women. Women did smoke, drink, travel, drive in cars, and use banks, but primarily in the company of men. In about half of the exceptional ads that did show women without men in the male world, the women were portrayed as decorations, as in one ad where an attractive and elaborately dressed woman was used to display an automobile.

Table 2

Nonworking Activities of Men and Women Shown in Advertisements[a]

	Percent of males			Percent of females		
	Alone or with males	With females	Total	Alone or with females	With males	Total
Proportion portrayed as nonworkers	37	71	55	90	92	91
Roles of nonworkers						
Family	18	24	22	21	25	23
Recreational	35	65	56	9	64	46
Decorative	47	11	22	70	11	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of nonworkers shown	68	153	221	86	168	254

[a] Based on number of adults shown. Note that some ads showed mixed groups containing unequal numbers of males and females.

Male-female interaction in advertisements was also examined. Ads were classified into three categories: male(s) only, female(s) only, and both sexes shown. Men only were shown in 40% of the ads, 26% showed women only, and 34% showed the two sexes together. Thus women were more likely than men to be shown in the company of the other sex.

Women were rarely shown interacting with other women. Of the ads showing just women, only 11% showed more than one. Of these nine ads, eight showed women as illustrations for clothing or beauty products; the other showed women in a family setting. Thirty ads showed mixed groups with more than one woman. In two-thirds of these, the women were shown interacting with only male partners. No women were shown as co-workers unless men were also present. Men were more than twice as likely to be shown interacting with members of their own sex. Of ads with men only, 19% showed more than one man. Most of these ads portrayed co-workers.

Of the ads showing men and women, 67% showed only one man and one woman. Of these, only one showed co-workers--these were musicians who had interrupted a duet to embrace! In the ads showing working men with women, the women seldom appeared in working roles. For example, a male doctor was shown examining a baby with the mother nearby. There were some exceptions: male and female entertainers were often shown together, and there were two additional ads that portrayed men and women as co-workers. One ad showed a female secretary, a male clerk, and their male boss; the other contained a group photograph of airline workers engaged in food preparation.

Discussion

In the magazines surveyed, there were few individual advertisements that could be considered depreciatory of women. These advertisements seemed to relfect the world as it is--for example, the average executive is a male. However, the picture as a whole does fail to show the true range of women's roles within our society. The ads reflected a number of stereotypes, discussed below.

"A woman's place is in the home." The ads studied here under-represented the 29 million working American women. Feminists point out that while the vast majority of American women are wives and mothers, many of them have other roles.

"Women do not make important decisions or do important things." The distribution of occupational and nonworking roles in the ads reinforces the feminists' impression that women are rarely shown engaged in important activities outside the home. In fact, in the advertisements examined, women were limited even in household decision making. They appeared to operate independently only for relatively inexpensive purchases--food, cosmetics, and cleaning products. For more expensive household purchases, men were brought into the ads, presumably because they share in buying decisions. Important business and societal institutions--banks, industrial firms, and the mass media--apparently did not consider women sufficiently significant to their businesses to feature them often in advertisements.

"Women are dependent and need men's protection." The advertisements suggest that there are certain business and social activities which are still inappropriate for women to perform on their own. Although some cigarette brands are promoted primarily for women, in this study there was not one cigarette ad that showed a woman smoking unless a male was present.

Table 3

Product Categories and Sex Roles

Product Category	Sex portrayed most often[a]	Ratio of ads showing males/ads showing females[b]
Cleaning products	Female	.00
Food products	Female	.45
Beauty products	Female	.60
Drugs	Female	.66
Furniture	Male	.71
Clothing	Female	.76
Home appliances	Female	.86
Charity	-	1.00
Travel	Male	1.30
Cars	Male	1.37
Alcoholic beverages	Male	1.63
Cigarettes	Male	1.90
Banks	Male	2.11
Industrial products	Male	2.17
Entertainment, media	Male	2.33
Institutional ads	Male	2.50

[a] Based on number of adults shown.
[b] Based on number of advertisements.

The isolation of women from their own sex within the ads augments the impression of dependence. Moreover, the traditional family roles in which women are often depicted in ads are roles in which they are dependent on men.

"Men regard women primarily as sexual objects; they are not interested in women as people." Some limited reflection of this stereotype is found in the decorative roles more often assigned to women than to men in the ads. The effect is heightened by showing women in relatively few working roles. Although ads showed men and women sharing recreational activities, women were rarely included in men's working lives.

Conclusion

There were few individual ads that could be considered offensive to women. In this study, only general magazines were selected on the assumption that they would be most likely to show women in meaningful occupational roles. Yet the total picture presented did reflect some clichés about women's roles that are considered by feminists to be highly unflattering.

The data suggest that feminists are at least partially justified in saying that advertisements do not present a full view of the variety of roles women actually play in American society. Consequently, advertisers as a group should be alert to the growing desire of many women that they be portrayed in their varied life roles. Those advertisers who choose to take the lead in portraying women in this way may benefit from favorable public reactions.

The data also suggest the need for more complete analysis of women's roles as shown in advertisements. Analysis of other categories of magazines and other media would be useful. In addition, images of women's intelligence and personality reflected in advertising should be analyzed more thoroughly. Finally, further research should attempt to discover what kinds of portraits of themselves women perceive as offensive.

Notes

[1] The numbers of advertisements showing adults in each of the sampled magazines were: Life, 38; Look, 30; Newsweek, 45; The New Yorker, 89; Readers' Digest, 51; Saturday Review, 14; Time, 26; U.S. News and World Report, 19. Ten ads appeared twice, two appeared three times, and one appeared four times. Thus repeated ads account for 10% of the total.

[2] In this last case, only a profile of the woman wearing earrings with a company's trademark was shown. Although she was coded as a semiprofessional worker, it might have been equally appropriate to consider her role as decorative.

References

1. Grant, Don. "Women's Libs Fume at 'Insulting Ads': Ad Gals Unruffled," Advertising Age, 44 (June 27, 1970).
2. Mannes, Marya. "Female of the Specious," Boston, 62 (September 1970), 54.
3. Smith, Janet. "Business and the Radicals, The Women--They Want Action," Dun's, 95 (June 1970), 46.
4. Wensberg, Peter. "Dubious Battlements," Boston, 62 (September 1970), 46.

SHAPE UP, BIONIC WOMAN!

Ann Pincus

My daughter Battle is 6 years old. Her brothers, Adam and Ward, are 8 1/2 and 10 years old, respectively. They watch a lot of TV programs. The boys even draw their make-believe heroes from the tube. A couple of years ago, their idols were Batman and Robin; last year they switched to Captain Kirk and Mr. Spock. More recently, they've been imitating "The Fonz" and Kotter. They identify closely with these larger-than-life heroes.

Who is there for my daughter to identify with? Lieutenant Uhura? Laverne and Shirley?

My answer is: THERE IS NO ONE. There is not one larger-than-life heroine worth mentioning, or one female life-style worth imitating. There aren't any at 7 o'clock at night and there wouldn't be any if I let her stay up seven nights a week until the 11 o'clock news.

Someone may say, "Oh, that's not at all true any more!" There's Wonder Woman and the Bionic Woman, even Police Woman. There's Mary Tyler Moore and Rhoda and Maude and Phyllis. This fall there's even Charley, the female protagonist in Norman Lear's new sitcom, "All's Fair."

True, these shows are about women. But are these women drawn from life? Are any of them heroines? Would anybody want to be like any of them? For that matter, should anybody want to be like any of them? Let's examine the kind of images they project.

Damsels in Distress

Mary Tyler Moore, the duenna of television sitcoms, started out six years ago as an assistant producer in name, but a girl Friday in fact, at a Minneapolis television studio. A couple of years ago, she got promoted to a full-fledged producer (a crumb dropped to the feminist movement), but her real function in the program--to play Ann Landers to her TV colleagues--has not changed.

The private life of TV's Mary Richards would demoralize the real Ann Landers. Despite the fact that she's had at least a dozen boyfriends over the years, she still has trouble telling a man what she thinks about him. She must be close to 40 in TV age, yet when a man makes a pass at her, she manages to put on the "oh, gee whiz, gosh, what'll I do" routine.

It may be great entertainment but she's not a great role model.

Rhoda has trouble with her job (and her husband) because she's so neurotic, Phyllis can't keep a job (or a man) because she's too dumb. Maude, who clearly is more intelligent and has more on the ball than her husband--a little wart named Walter--stays at home while her husband botches up their bank accounts at the office. Maude also suffers from being on the verge of hysteria all the time. Perhaps that's the reason she doesn't get a job.

Mary Hartman doesn't count, but Charley of "All's Fair" does because she has a real-life job. She is a photographer for a newsweekly, yet she is hopelessly dizzy, offensively aggressive and stupid. She couldn't get a job selling Instamatic cameras, much less using a Leica.

What kind of role model is that?

Angie Dickinson as Police Woman certainly landed a good job with the LAPD. It apparently pays well because she wears clothes that would make Jackie O green with envy. I may be wrong, but it seems to me she got her job by playing up to the boss. She certainly is a flirt. She does tote a gun and go along with the boys to track down the bad guys, but she tends to get caught by the villains--due to mistakes such as tripping over a twig or some other clever move--and has to be rescued by her colleagues.

Tough Cookies Crumble

Wonder Woman had possibilities. But her only motivation to right wrongs appears to be to save her beloved Major Trevor from harm. That leaves only the Bionic Woman, the Eve-like offshoot of the Six Million Dollar Man who miraculously manages to be weaker than he even though they have the same machines in their mechanical legs.

Now, you will say (alas, my husband has already said it) that the male-role models seen on television are not positive either, that some men are portrayed as bigots and most act like klutzes. But you are wrong. And my husband is wrong. Men in television, whether in sitcoms or dramatic series, ordinarily are the Decision Makers, the Problem Solvers. It is their wit or wisdom or *savoir faire* that tricks the villain. Just look at Columbo or Kojak or Starsky and Hutch or Steve Austin, the guys in "Switch" or "M*A*S*H" or "Hawaii Five-O," or Raymond Burr in any of his incarnations.

There have, of course, been women on TV who dealt with "life." Good or bad, they quickly disappeared. Remember Faye, the gay divorcee? Kate McShane was another *involved* woman. She was a lawyer, and by inference a good role model. Unfortunately, she couldn't make a move without consulting her brother, the priest, or her father, the mentor. "McNaughton's Daughter" was much better. She, too, was a lawyer who fought injustice, and she managed to be self-sufficient. She didn't even last one season.

My Heroine

It must be said that true heroines are hard to find in any kind of fiction. Tom Sawyer was brave and daring while Becky Thatcher had hysterics in the cave. And my favorite schoolgirl idol, Jo March of "Little Women," finally disappointed me. It was fine and noble to run a school for the needy. But why did it have to be a school mainly for boys? What about the girls?

There was at least one role model for young girls to identify with on the radio 25 or 30 years ago. Her name was Lorelei Kilbourne and no doubt she inspired a whole generation of women to become journalists. She was the intrepid girl reporter who, with Steve Wilson, tracked down many a miscarriage of justice on "Big Town." She was wonderful. She had a real job. She was paid for her work. She was good at it. She made difficult decisions and, as far as I know, she didn't quit to get married.

Why can't television create someone like that? A more accurate question is: why can't American television create someone like that? British television created just such a character in "The Avengers" about fifteen years ago.

At least television programs should have women in them who are wives, mothers and working women. More and more American women juggle all three jobs; why shouldn't the television screen reflect that?

We've had the Bionic Woman. Now let's try for a Three-Dimensional Woman.

Burbank, can you hear me?

HOMOGENIZING THE AMERICAN WOMAN: THE POWER OF AN UNCONSCIOUS IDEOLOGY

Sandra Bem and Daryl Bem

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.... And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.... And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman and brought her unto the man.... And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou has done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.... Unto the woman God said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." (Gen. 1, 2, 3)

There is a moral to that story. St. Paul spells it out even more clearly.

"For a man ... is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." (1 Cor.)

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed and then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety." (1 Tim. 2)

Now one should not assume that only Christians have this kind of rich haritage of ideology about women. So consider now, the morning prayer of the Orthodox Jew:

"Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe, that I was not born a gentile."

"Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe, that I was not born a slave."

"Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe, that I was not born a woman."

Or, consider the Koran, the sacred text of Islam:

"Men are superior to women on account of the qualities in which God has given them preeminence."

Because they think they sense a decline in feminine "Faith, charity, and holiness with sobriety," many people today jump to the conclusion that the ideology expressed in these passages is a relic of the past. Not so, of course. It has simply been obscured by an egalitarian veneer, and the same ideology has now become unconscious. That is, we remain unaware of it because alternative beliefs and attitudes about women, until very recently, have gone unimagined. We are very much like the fish who is unaware of the fact that its environment is wet. After all, what else could it be? Such is the nature of all unconscious idealogies in a society. Such, in particular, is the nature of America's ideology about women.

What we should like to do in this paper is to discuss today's version of this same ideology.

* * * * * * * *

When a baby boy is born, it is difficult to predict what he will be doing 25 years later. We can't say whether he will be an artist, a doctor, a lawyer, a college professor, or a bricklayer, because he will be permitted to develop and fulfill his own unique potential -- particularly, of course, if he happens to be white and middle class. But if that same newborn child happens to be a girl, we can predict with almost complete confidence how she is likely to be spending her time some 25 years later. Why can we do that? Because her individuality doesn't have to be considered. Her individuality is irrelevant. Time studies have shown that she will spend the equivalent of a full working day, 7.1 hours, in preparing meals, cleaning house, laundering, mending, shopping and doing other household tasks. In other words, 43% of her waking time will be spent in activity that would command an hourly wage on the open market well below the federally set minimum for menial industrial work.

Of course, the point really is not how little she would earn if she did these things in someone else's home. She will be doing them in her own home for free. The point is that this use of time is virtually the same for homemakers with college degrees and for homemakers with less than a grade school education, for women married to professional men and for women married to blue-collar workers. Actually, that's understating it slightly. What the time study really showed was that college-educated women spend slightly more time cleaning their houses than their less-educated counterparts!

Of course, it is not simply the full-time homemaker whose unique identity has been rendered largely irrelevant. Of the 31 million women who work outside the home in our society, 78% end up in dead-end jobs as clerical workers, service workers, factory workers, or sales clerks, compared to a comparable figure of 40% for men. Only 15% of all women workers in our society are classified by the Labor Department as professional or technical workers, and even this figure is misleading -- for the single, poorly-paid occupation of non-college teacher absorbs half of these women, and the occupation of nurse absorbs an additional quarter. In other words, the two jobs of teacher and nurse absorb three-quarters of all women classified in our society as technical or professional. That means, then, that fewer than 5% of all professional women -- fewer than 1% of all women workers -- fill those positions which to most Americans connote "professional": Physician, lawyer, engineer, scientist, college professor, journalist, writer, and so forth.

Even an I.Q. in the genius range does not guarantee that a woman's unique potential will find expression. There was a famous study of over 1300 boys and girls whose I.Q.'s averaged 151 (Terman & Oden, 1959). When the study began in the early 1900's, these highly gifted youngsters were only ten years old, and their careers have been followed ever since. Where are they today? 86% of the men have now achieved prominence in professional and managerial occupations. In contrast, only a minority of the women were even employed. Of those who were, 37% were nurses, librarians, social workers, and non-college teachers. An additional 26% were secretaries, stenographers, bookkeepers, and office workers! Only 11% entered the higher professions of law, medicine, college teaching, engineering, science, economics, and the like. And even at age 44, well after all their children had gone to school, 61% of these highly gifted women remained full-time homemakers. Talent, education, ability, interests, motivations: all irrelevant. In our society, being female uniquely qualifies an individual for domestic work — either by itself or in conjunction with typing, teaching, nursing, or (most often) unskilled labor. It is this homogenization of America's women which is the major consequence of our society's sex-role ideology.

It is true, of course, that most women have several hours of leisure time every day. And it is here, we are often told, that each woman can express her unique identity. Thus, politically interested women can join the League of Women Voters. Women with humane interests can become part-time Gray Ladies. Women who love music can raise money for symphony. Protestant women play Canasta; Jewish women play Mah Jongg; brighter women of all denominations and faculty wives play bridge.

But politically interested *men* serve in legislatures. *Men* with humane interests become physicians or clinical psychologists. *Men* who love music play in the symphony. In other words, why should a woman's unique identity determine only the periphery of her life rather than its central core?

Why? Why nurse rather than physician, secretary rather than executive, stewardess rather than pilot? Why faculty wife rather than faculty? Why doctor's mother rather than doctor? There are three basic answers to this question: (1) discrimination; (2) sex-role conditioning; and (3) the presumed incompatibility of family and career.

Discrimination

In 1968, the median income of full-time women workers was approximately $1500. The comparable figure for men was $3000 higher. Moreover, the gap is widening. Ten years ago, women earned 64% of what men did; that percentage has now shrunk to 58%. Today, a female college graduate working full-time can expect to earn less per year than a male high school dropout.

There are two reasons for this pay differential. First, in every category of occupation, women are employed in the lesser-skilled, lower-paid positions. Even in the clerical field, where 73% of the workers are women, females are relegated to the lowest status positions and hence earn only 65% of what male clerical workers earn. The second reason for this pay differential is discrimination in its purest form: unequal pay for equal work. According to a survey of 206 companies in

1970, female college graduates were offered jobs which paid $43 per month less than those offered to their male counterparts in the same college major.

New laws should begin to correct both of these situations. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibits employers from discriminating on the basis of sex in the payment of wages for equal work. In a landmark ruling on May 18, 1970, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered that $250,000 in back pay be paid to women employed by a single New Jersey glass company. This decision followed a two-year court battle by the Labor Department after it found that the company was paying men selector-packers 21.5 cents more per hour than women doing the same work. In a similar case, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals ordered a major can company to pay more than $100,000 in back wages to women doing equal work. According to the Labor Department, an estimated $17-million is owed to women in back pay. Since that estimate was made, a 1972 amendment extended the Act to cover executive, administrative and professional employees as well.

But to enjoy equal pay, women must also have access to equal jobs. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin -- and sex. Although the sex provision was treated as a joke at the time (and was originally introduced by a Southern Congressman in an attempt to defeat the bill), the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission discovered in its first year of operation that 40% or more of the complaints warranting investigation charged discrimination on the basis of sex (Bird, 1969).

Title VII has served as one of the most effective instruments in helping to achieve sex equality in the world of work. According to a report by the E.E.O.C., nearly 6,000 charges of sex discrimination were filed with the agency in 1971 alone, a 62% increase over the previous year.

But the most significant legislative breakthrough in the area of sex equality was the passage of the Equal Righsts Amendment by both houses of Congress in 1972. The ERA simply states that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." This amendment had been introduced into every session of Congress since 1923, and its passage now is clearly an indication of the changing role of the American women. All of the various ramifications are hard to predict, but it is clear that it will have profound consequences in private as well as public life.

Many Americans assume that the recent drive for equality between the sexes is primarily for the benefit of the middle-class woman who wants to seek self-fulfillment in a professional career. But in many ways, it is the woman in more modest circumstances, the woman who must work for economic reasons, who stands to benefit most from the removal of discriminatory barriers. It is she who is hardest hit by unequal pay; it is she who so desperately needs adequate day-care facilities; it is her job which is often dead-ended while her male colleagues in the factory get trained and promoted into the skilled craft jobs. And if both she and her husband work at unfulfilling jobs eight hours a day just to make an adequate income, it is still she who carries the additional burden of domestic chores when they return home.

We think it is important to emphasize these points at the outset, for we have chosen to focus our remarks in this particular paper on those fortunate men and women who can afford the luxury of pursuing self-fulfillment through the world of work and career. But every societal reform advocated by the new feminist movement, whether it be the Equal Rights Amendment, the establishment of child-care centers, or basic changes in America's sex-role ideology, will affect the lives of men and women in every economic circumstance. Nevertheless, it is still economic discrimination which hits hardest at the largest group of women, and it is here that the drive for equality can be most successfully launched with legislative and judicial tools.

Sex-Role Conditioning

But even if all discrimination were to end tomorrow, nothing very drastic would change. For job discrimination is only part of the problem. It does impede women who choose to become lawyers or managers or physicians. But it does not, by itself, help us to understand why so many women "choose" to be secretaries or nurses rather than executives or physicians; why only 3% of 9th grade girls as compared to 25% of the boys "choose" careers in science or engineering; or why 63% of America's married women "choose" not to work at all. It certainly doesn't explain those young women whose vision of the future includes only marriage, children, and living happily ever after; who may, at some point, "choose" to take a job, but who almost never "choose" to pursue a career. Discrimination frustrates choices already made. Something more pernicious perverts the motivation to choose.

That "something" is an unconscious ideology about the nature of the female sex, an ideology which constricts the emerging self-image of the female child and the nature of her aspirations from the very beginning; an ideology which leads even those Americans who agree that a black skin should not uniquely qualify its owner for a janitorial or domestic service to act as if the possession of a uterus uniquely qualifies its owner for precisely such service.

Consider, for example, the 1968 student rebellion at Columbia University. Students from the radical Left took over some administration buildings in the name of egalitarian ideals which they accused the university of flouting. Here were the most militant spokesmen one could hope to find in the cause of equalitarian ideals. But no sooner had they occupied the buildings than the male militants blandly turned to their sisters-in-arms and assigned them the task of preparing the food, while they -- the menfolk -- would presumably plan future strategy. The reply these males received was the reply that they deserved -- we will leave that to your imagination -- and the fact that domestic tasks behind the barricades were desegregated across the sex line that day is an everlasting tribute to the class consciousness of these ladies of the Left. And it was really on that day that the campus women's liberation movement got its start -- when radical women finally realized that they were never going to get to make revolution, only coffee.

But these conscious co-eds are not typical, for the unconscious assumptions about a woman's "natural" talents (or lack of them) are at least as prevalent among women as they are among men. A psychologist named Phillip Goldberg (1968) demonstrated this by asking female college students to rate a number of professional articles from each of six fields. The articles were collated into two equal sets of booklets, and the names of the authors were changed so that the identical article was attributed to a male author (e.g., John T. McKay) in one booklet and to a female author (e.g., Joan T. McKay) in the other booklet. Each student was asked to read the articles in her booklet and to rate them for value, competence, persuasiveness, writing style, and so forth.

As he had anticipated, Goldberg found that the identical article received significantly lower ratings when it was attributed to a female author than when it was attributed to a male author. He had predicted this result for articles from professional fields generally considered the province of men, like law or city planning, but to his surprise, these women also downgraded articles from the fields of dietetics and elementary school education when they were attributed to female authors. In other words, these students rated the male authors as better at everything, agreeing with Aristotle that "we should regard the female nature as afflicted with a natural defectiveness." Such is the nature of America's unconscious ideology about women.

When does this ideology begin to affect the life of a young girl? Research now tells us that from the day a newborn child is dressed in pink, she is given "special" treatment. Perhaps because they are thought to be more fragile, six-month-old infant girls are actually touched, spoken to, and hovered over more by their mothers while they are playing than are infant boys (Goldberg & Lewis, 1969). One study even showed that when mothers and babies are still in the hospital, mothers smile at, talk to, and touch their female infants more than their male infants at two days of age (Thoman, Leiderman, & Olson, 1972). Differential treatment can't begin much earlier than that.

As children begin to read, the storybook characters become the images and the models that little boys and little girls aspire to become. What kind of role does the female play in the world of children's literature? The fact is that there aren't even very many females in that world. One survey (Fisher, 1970) found that five times as many males as females appear in the titles of children's books; the fantasy world of Doctor Seuss is almost entirely male; and even animals and machines are represented as male. When females do appear, they are noteworthy primarily for what they do not do. They do not drive cars, and they seldom even ride bicycles. In one story in which a girl does ride a bicycle, it's a two-seater. Guess where the girl is seated! Boys in these stories climb trees and fish and roll in the leaves and skate. Girls watch, fall down, and get dizzy. Girls are never doctors, and although they may be nurses or librarians or teachers, they are never principals. There seemed to be only one children's book about mothers who work, and it concludes that what mothers love "best of all" is "being your very own Mommy and coming home to you." And although this is no doubt true of many daddies as well, no book about working fathers has ever found it necessary to apologize for working in quite the same way.

As children grow older, more explicit sex-role training is introduced. Boys are encouraged to take more of an interest in mathematics and science. Boys, not girls, are usually given chemistry sets and microscopes for Christmas. Moreover, all children quickly learn that mommy is proud to be a moron when it comes to math and science, whereas daddy is a little ashamed if he doesn't know all about such things. When a young boy returns from school all excited about biology, he is almost certain to be encouraged to think of becoming a physician. A girl with similar enthusiasm is usually told that she might want to consider nurse's training later on, so she can have "an interesting job to fall back upon in case -- God forbid -- she ever needs to support herself." A very different kind of encouragement. And any girl who doggedly persists in her enthusiasm for science is likely to find her parents as horrified by the prospect of a permanent love affair with physics as they would be either by the prospect of an interracial marriage or, horror of horrors, no marriage at all. Indeed, our graduate women report that their families seem convinced that the menopause must come at age 23.

These socialization practices take their toll. When they apply for college, boys and girls are about equal on verbal aptitude tests, but boys score significantly higher on mathematical aptitude tests -- about 60 points higher on the College Board Exams, for example (Brown, 1965). Moreover, for those who are convinced that this is due to female hormones, it is relevant to know that girls improve their mathematical performance if the problems are simply reworded so that they deal with cooking and gardening, even though the abstract reasoning required for solution remains exactly the same (Milton, 1958). That's not hormones! Clearly, what has been undermined is not a woman's mathematical ability, but rather her confidence in that ability.

But these effects in mathematics and science are only part of the story. The most conspicuous outcome of all is that the majority of America's women become full-time homemakers. And of those who do work, nearly 80% end up in dead-end jobs as clerical workers, service workers, factory workers or sales clerks. Again, it is this "homogenization" of America's women which is the major consequence of America's sex-role ideology.

The important point is not that the role of homemaker is necessarily inferior, but rather that our society is managing to consign a large segment of its population to the role of homemaker -- either with or without a dead-end job -- solely on the basis of sex just as inexorably as it has in the past consigned the individual with a black skin to the role of janitor or domestic. The important point is that in spite of their unique identities, the majority of American women end up in virtually the same role.

The socialization of the American male has closed off certain options for him, too. Men are discouraged from developing certain desirable traits such as tenderness and sensitivity, just as surely as women are discouraged from being assertive and, alas, "too bright." Young boys are encouraged to be incompetent at cooking and certainly child care, just as surely as young girls are urged to be incompetent at math and science. The elimination of sex-role stereotyping implies that each individual would be encouraged to "do his or her own thing." Men and women would no longer be stereotyped by society's definitions of masculine and feminine. If sensitivity, emotionality and warmth are desirable human characteristics, then they are desirable for men as well as for women. If independence, assertiveness and serious intellectual commitment are desirable human characteristics, they are desirable for women as well as for men. Thus, we are not implying that men have all the goodies and that women can obtain self-fulfillment by acting like men. That is hardly the utopia implied by today's feminist movement. Rather, we envision a society which raises its children so flexibly and with sufficient respect for the integrity of individual uniqueness that some men might emerge with the motivation, the ability and the opportunity to stay home and raise children without bearing the stigma of being peculiar. Indeed, if homemaking is as glamorous as women's magazines and television commercials would have us believe, then men, too, should have that option. And even if homemaking isn't all that glamorous, it would probably still be more fulfilling for some men than the jobs in which they now find themselves forced because of their role as breadwinner. Thus, it is true that a man's options are also limited by our society's sex-role ideology, but as the "predictability test" reveals, it is still the women in our society whose identity is rendered irrelevant by America's socialization practices.

Further Psychological Barriers

But what of the woman who arrives at age 21 still motivated to be challenged and fulfilled by a growing career? Is she free to choose a career if she cares to do so? Or is there something standing even in her way?

There is. Even the woman who has managed to finesse society's attempt to rob her of her career motivations is likely to find herself blocked by society's trump card: the feeling that one cannot have a career and be a successful woman simultaneously. A competent and motivated woman is thus caught in double-bind which few men have ever faced. She must worry not only about failure, but also about success.

This conflict was strikingly revealed in a study which required college women to complete the following story: "After first-term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical-school class" (Horner, 1969). The stories were then examined for concern about the negative consequences of success. The women in this study all had high intellectual ability and histories of academic success. They were the very women who could have successful careers. And yet, over two-thirds of their stories revealed a clear cut inability to cope with the concept of a feminine, yet career-oriented, woman.

The most common "fear-of-success" stories showed fears of social rejection as a result of success. The woman in this group showed anxiety about becoming unpopular, unmarriageable and lonely:

> Anne starts proclaiming her surprise and joy. Her fellow classmates are so disgusted with her behavior that they jump on her in a body and beat her. She is maimed for life.

> Anne is an acne-faced bookworm.... She studies twelve hours a day, and lives at home to save money. "Well, it certainly paid off.

> All the Friday and Saturday nights without dates, fun -- I'll be the best woman doctor alive." And yet a twinge of sadness comes through -- she wonders what she really has...
>
> Anne doesn't want to be number one in her class.... She feels she shouldn't rank so high because of social reasons. She drops to ninth and then marries the boy who graduates number one.

In the second "fear-of-success" category were stories in which the women seemed concerned about definitions of womanhood. These stories expressed guilt and despair over success and doubts about their femininity and normality:

> Unfortunately Anne no longer feels so certain that she really wants to be a doctor. She is worried about herself and wonders if perhaps she is not normal.... Anne decides not to continue with her medical work but to take courses that have a deeper personal meaning to her.
>
> Anne feels guilty.... She will finally have a nervous breakdown and quit medical school and marry a successful young doctor.

A third group of stories could not even face up to the conflict between having a career and being a woman. These stories simply denied the possibility that any woman could be so successful:

> Anne is a code name for a nonexistent person created by a group of med students. They take turns writing for Anne....
>
> Anne is really happy she's on top, though Tom is higher than she -- though that's as it should be. Anne doesn't mind Tom winning.
>
> Anne is talking to her counselor. Counselor says she will make a fine nurse.

By way of contrast, here is a typical story written not about Anne, but about John:

> John has worked very hard and his long hours of study have paid off.... He is thinking about his girl, Cheri, whom he will marry at the end of med school. He realizes he can give her all the things she desires after he becomes established. He will go on in med school and be successful in the long run.

Nevertheless, there were a few women in the study who welcomed the prospect of success:

> Anne is quite a lady -- not only is she top academically, but she is liked and admired by her fellow students -- quite a trick in a man-dominated field. She is brilliant -- but she is also a woman. She will continue to be at or near the top. And... always a lady.

Hopefully the day is approaching when as many "Anne" stories as "John" stories will have happy endings. But notice that even this story finds it necessary to affirm repeatedly that femininity is not necessarily destroyed by accomplishment. One would never encounter a comparable story written about John who, although brilliant and at the top of his class, is "still a man, still a man, still a man."

It seems unlikely that anyone in our society would view these "fear-of-success" stories as portraits of mental health. But even our concept of mental health has been distorted by America's sex-role stereotypes. Here we must indict our own profession of psychology. A recent survey of seventy-nine clinically-trained psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers, both male and female, revealed a double standard of mental health (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970). That is, even professional clinicians have two different concepts of mental health, one for men and one for women; and these concepts parallel the sex-role stereotypes prevalent in our society. Thus, according to these clinicians, a woman is to be regarded as healthier and more mature if she is: more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable in minor crises, more susceptible to hurt feelings, more emotional, more conceited about her appearance, less objective, and more antagonistic toward math and science! But this was the very same description which these clinicians used to characterize an unhealthy, immature man or an unhealthy, immature adult (sex unspecified)! The equation is clear: Mature woman equals immature adult.

Given this concept of a mature woman, is it any wonder that few women ever aspire toward challenging and fulfilling careers? In order to have a career, a woman will probably need to become relatively more dominant, independent, adventurous, aggressive, competitive and objective, and relatively less excitable, emotional and conceited than our ideal of femininity requires. If she were a man (or an adult, sex unspecified), these would all be considered positive traits. But because she is a woman, these same traits will bring her disapproval. She must then either be strong enough to have her "femininity" questioned; or she must behave in the prescribed feminine manner and accept second-class status, as an adult and as a professional.

And, of course, should a woman faced with this conflict seek professional help, hoping to summon the strength she will need to pursue her career goals, the advice she is likely to receive will be of virtually no use. For, as this study reveals, even professional counselors have been contaminated by the sex-role ideology.

It is frequently argued that a 21-year-old woman is perfectly free to choose a career if she cares to do so. No one is standing in her way. But this argument conveniently overlooks the fact that our society has spent 20 years carefully marking the woman's ballot for her, and so it has nothing to lose in that 21st year by pretending to let her cast it for the alternative of her choice. Society has controlled not her alternatives (although discrimination does do that), but more importantly, it has controlled her motivation to choose any but one of those alternatives. The so-called "freedom-to-choose" is illusory, and it cannot be invoked to justify a society which controls the woman's motivation to choose.

Biological Considerations

Up to this point, we have argued that the differing life patterns of men and women in our society can be chiefly accounted for by cultural conditioning. The most common counter argument to this view, of course, is the biological one. The biological argument suggests that there may really be inborn differences between men and women in, say, independence or mathematical ability. Or that there may be biological factors beyond the fact that women can become pregnant and nurse children which uniquely dictate that they, but not men, should stay home all day and shun serious outside commitment. What this argument suggests is that maybe female hormones really are responsible somehow. One difficulty with this argument, of course, is that female hormones would have to be different in the Soviet Union, where one-third of the engineers and 75% of the physicians are women (Dodge, 1966). In America, by way of contrast, women constitute less than 1% of the engineers and only 7% of the physicians. Female physiology is different, and it may account for some of the psychological differences between the sexes, but American's sex-role ideology still seems primarily responsible for the fact that so few women emerge from childhood with the motivation to seek out any role beyond the one that our society dictates.

But even if there really were biological differences between the sexes along these lines, the biological argument would still be irrelevant. The reason can best be illustrated with an analogy.

Suppose that every black American boy were to be socialized to become a jazz musician on the assumption that he has a "natural" talent in that direction; or suppose that parents and counselors should subtly discourage him from other pursuits because it is considered "inappropriate" for black men to become physicians or physicists. Most Americans would disapprove. But suppose that it could be demonstrated that black Americans, on the average, did possess an inborn better sense of rhythm than white Americans. Would that justify ignoring the unique characteristics of a particular black youngster from the very beginning and specifically socializing him to become a musician? We don't think so. Similarly, as long as a woman's socialization does not nurture her uniqueness, but treats her only as a member of a group on the basis of some assumed average characteristic, she will not be prepared to realize her own potential in the way that the values of individuality and self-fulfillment imply that she should.

The Presumed Incompatibility of Family and Career

If we were to ask the average American woman why she is not pursuing a full-time career, she would probably not say that discrimination had discouraged her; nor would she be likely to recognize the pervasive effects of her own sex-role conditioning. What she probably would say is that a career, no matter how desirable, is simply incompatible with the role of wife and mother.

As recently as the turn of the century, and in less technological societies today, this incompatibility between career and family was, in fact, decisive. Women died in their forties and they were pregnant or nursing during most of their adult lives. Moreover, the work that a less technological society requires places a premium on mobility and physical strength, neither of which a pregnant woman has a great deal of. Thus, the historical division of labor between the sexes -- the man away at work and the woman at home with the children -- was a biological necessity. Today it is not.

Today, the work that our technological society requires is primarily mental in nature; women have virtually complete control over their reproductive lives; and most important of all, the average American woman now lives to age 74 and has her last child before age 30. This means that by the time a woman is 35 or so, her children all have more important things to do with their daytime hours than to spend them entertaining some adult woman who has nothing fulfilling to do during the entire second half of her life span.

But social forms have a way of outliving the necessities which gave rise to them. And today's female adolescent continues to plan for a 19th-century life style in a 20th-century world. A Gallup poll has found that young women give no thought whatever to life after forty (Gallup & Hill, 1962). They plan to graduate from high school, perhaps go to college, and then get married. Period!

The Woman as Wife

At some level, of course, this kind of planning is "realistic." Because most women do grow up to be wives and mothers, and because, for many women, this means that they will be leaving the labor force during the child-rearing years, a career is not really feasible. After all, a career involves long-term commitment and perhaps some sacrifice on the part of the family. Furthermore, as every "successful" woman knows, a wife's appropriate role is to encourage her husband in his career. The "good" wife puts her husband through school, endures the family's early financial difficulties and, if her husband's career should suddenly dictate a move to another city, she sees to it that the transition is accomplished as painlessly as possible. The good wife is selfless. And to be seriously concerned about one's own career is selfish -- if one is female, that is. With these kinds of constraints imposed upon the work life of the married woman, perhaps it would be "unrealistic" for her to seriously aspire toward a career rather than a job.

There is some evidence of discontent among these "selfless" women, however. A 1962 Gallup poll (Gallup & Hill, 1962) revealed that only 10% of American women would want their daughters to live their lives the way they did. These mothers wanted their daughters to get more education and to marry later. And a 1970 study of women married to top Chicago-area business and professional men (Ringo, 1970) revealed that if these women could live their lives over again, they would pursue careers.

Accordingly, the traditional conception of the husband-wife relationship is now being challenged, not so much because of this widespread discontent among older, married women, but because it violates two of the most basic values of today's college generation. These values concern personal growth, on the one hand, and interpersonal relationships on the other. The first of these emphasizes individuality and self-fulfillment; the second stresses openness, honesty, and equality in all human relationships.

Because they see the traditional male-female relationship as incompatible with these basic values today's young people are experimenting with alternatives to the traditional marriage pattern. Although a few are testing out ideas like communal living, most seem to be searching for satisfactory modifications of the husband-wife relationship, either in or out of the context of marriage. An increasing number of young people claim to be seeking fully egalitarian relationships and they cite examples like the following:

> "Both my wife and I earned college degrees in our respective disciplines. I turned down a superior job offer in Oregon and accepted a slightly less desirable position in New York where my wife would have more opportunities for part-time work in her specialty. Although I would have preferred to live in a suburb, we purchased a home near my wife's job so that she could have an office at home where she would be when the children returned from school. Because my wife earns a good salary, she can easily afford to pay a housekeeper to do her major household chores. My wife and I share all other tasks around the house equally. For example, she cooks the meals, but I do the laundry for her and help her with many of her other household tasks."

Without questioning the basic happiness of such a marriage or its appropriateness for many couples, we can legitimately ask if such a marriage is, in fact, an instance of interpersonal equality. Have all the hidden assumptions about the woman's "natural" role really been eliminated? Have our visionary students really exorcised the traditional ideology as they claim? There is a very simple test. If the marriage is truly equalitarian, then its description should retain the same flavor and tone even if the roles of the husband and wife were to be reversed:

> "Both my husband and I earned college degrees in our respective disciplines. I turned down a superior job offer in Oregon and accepted a slightly less desirable position in New York where my husband would have more opportunities for part-time work in his specialty. Although I would have preferred to live in a suburb, we purchased a home near my husband's job so that he could have an office at home where he would be when the children returned from school. Because my husband earns a good salary, he can easily afford to pay a housekeeper to do his major household chores. My husband and I share all other tasks around the house equally. For example, he cooks the meals, but I do the laundry for him and help him with many of his other household tasks."

Somehow it sounds different, and yet only the pronouns have been changed to protect the powerful! Certainly no one would ever mistake the marriage just described as egalitarian or even very desirable, and thus it becomes apparent that the ideology about the woman's "natural" place unconsciously permeates the entire fabric of such "pseudo-egalitarian" marriages. It is true the wife gains some measure of equality when she can have a career rather than have a job and when her career can influence the final place of residence. But why is it the unquestioned assumption that the husband's career solely determines the initial set of alternatives that are to be considered? Why is it the wife who automatically seeks the part-time position? Why is it her housekeeper rather than their housekeeper? Why her household tasks? And so forth throughout the entire relationship.

The important point is not that such marriages are bad or that their basic assumptions of inequality produce unhappy, frustrated women. Quite the contrary. It is the very happiness of the wives in such marriages that reveals society's smashing success in socializing its women. It is a measure of the distance our society must yet traverse toward the goal of full equality that such marriages are widely characterized as utopian and fully equalitarian. It is a mark of how well the woman has been kept in her place that the husband in such a marriage is almost always idolized by women, including his wife. Why? Because he "permits her" to squeeze a career into the interstices of their marriage as long as his own career is not unduly inconvenienced. Thus is the white man blessed for exercising his power benignly while his "natural" right to that power forever remains unquestioned. Such is the subtlety of America's ideology about women.

In fact, however, even these "benign" inequities are now being challenged. More and more young couples really are entering marriages of full equality, marriages in which both partners pursue careers or outside commitments which carry equal weight when all important decisions are to be made, marriages in which both husband and wife accept some compromise in the growth of their respective careers for their mutual partnership. Certainly such marriages have more tactical difficulties than more traditional ones: It is simply more difficult to coordinate two independent lives rather than one-and-a half. The point is that it is not possible to predict ahead of time on the basis of sex, who will be doing the compromising at any given point of decision.

It should be clear that the man or woman who places career above all else ought not to enter an egalitarian marriage. The man would do better to marry a traditional wife, a wife who will make whatever sacrifices his career necessitates. The woman who places career above all else would do better -- in our present society -- to remain single. For an egalitarian marriage is not designed for extra efficiency, but for double fulfillment.

The Woman as Mother

In all marriages, whether traditional, pseudo-equalitarian or fully equalitarian, the real question surrounding a mother's career will probably continue to be the well-being of the children. All parents want to be certain that they are doing the very best for their children and that they are not depriving them in any important way, either materially or psychologically. What this has meant recently in most families that could afford it was that mother would devote herself to the children on a full-time basis. Women have been convinced that there is something wrong with them if they even want to do otherwise.

For example, according to Dr. Spock (1963), any woman who finds full-time motherhood unfulfilling is showing "a residue of difficult relationships in her own childhood." If a vacation doesn't solve the problem, then she is probably having emotional problems which can be relieved "through regular counseling in a family social agency, or if severe, through psychiatric treatment.... Any mother of a pre-school child who is considering a job should discuss the issues with a social worker before making her decision." The message is clear: If you don't feel that your two-year-old is a stimulating, full-time, companion, then you are probably neurotic.

In fact, research does not support the view that children suffer in any way when mother works. Although it came as a surprise to most researchers in the area, maternal employment in and of itself does not seem to have any negative effects on the children; and part-time work actually seems to benefit the children. Children of working mothers are no more likely than children of non-working mothers to be delinquent or nervous or withdrawn or anti-social; they are no more likely to show neurotic symptoms; they are no more likely to perform poorly in school; and they are no more likely to feel deprived of their mother's love. Daughters of working mothers are more likely to want to work themselves, and, when asked to name the one woman in the world that they most admire, daughters of working mothers are more likely to name their own mothers! (Nye & Hoffman, 1963). This is one finding that we wish every working woman in America could hear, because the other thing that is true of almost every working mother is that she thinks she is hurting her children and she feels guilty. In fact, research has shown that the worst mothers are those who would like to work, but who stay home out of a sense of duty (Yarrow, Scott, de Leeuw, & Heinig, 1962). The major conclusion from all the research is really this: What matters is the quality of a mother's relationship with her children, not the time of day it happens to be administered. This conclusion should come as no surprise; successful fathers have been demonstrating it for years. Some fathers are great, some fathers stink, and they're all at work at least eight hours a day.

Similarly, it is true that the quality of substitute care that children receive while their parents are at work also matters. Young children do need security, and research has shown that it is not good to have a constant turnover of parent-substitutes, a rapid succession of changing baby-sitters or housekeepers (Maccoby, 1958). Clearly, this is why the establishment of child care centers is vitally important at the moment. This is why virtually every woman's group in the country, no matter how conservative or how radical, is in agreement on this one issue: that child care centers ought to be available to those who need them.

Once again, it is relevant to emphasize that child care centers, like the other reforms advocated, are not merely for the benefit of middle-class women who wish to pursue professional careers. Of the 31 million women in the labor force, nearly 40% of them are working mothers. In 1960, mothers constituted more than one-third of the total woman labor force. In March, 1971, more than 1 out of 3 working mothers (4.3 million of them) had children under 6 years of age, and about half of these had children under 3 years of age. And most of these women in the labor force -- like most men -- work because they cannot afford to do otherwise. Moreover, they cannot currently deduct the full costs of child care as a business expense as the executive can often deduct an expensive car. At the moment, the majority of these working women must simply "make do" with whatever child care arrangements they can manage. Only 6% of their children under 6 years of age currently receive group care in child care centers. This is why child-care centers are a central issue of the new feminist movement. This is why they are not just an additional luxury for the middle-class family with a woman who wants to pursue a professional career.

But even the woman who is educationally and economically in a position to pursue a career must feel free to utilize these alternative arrangements for child care. For once again, America's sex-role ideology intrudes. Many people still assume that if a woman wants a full-time career, then children must be unimportant to her. But of course, no one makes this assumption about her husband. No one assumes that a father's interest in his career necessarily precludes a deep and abiding affection for his children or a vital interest in their development. Once again, America applies a double standard of judgment. Suppose that a father of small children suddenly lost his wife. No matter how much he loved his children, no one would expect him to sacrifice his career in order to stay home with them on a full-time basis -- even if he had an independent source of income. No one would charge him with selfishness or lack of parental feeling if he sought professional care for his children during the day.

It is here that full equality between husband and wife assumes its ultimate importance. The fully egalitarian marriage abolishes this double standard and extends the same freedom to the mother. The egalitarian marriage provides the framework for both husband and wife to pursue careers which are challenging and fulfilling and, at the same time, to participate equally in the pleasures and responsibilities of childrearing. Indeed, it is the egalitarian marriage which has the potential for giving children the love and concern of two parents rather than one. And it is the egalitarian marriage which has the most potential for giving parents the challenge and fulfillment of two worlds -- family and career -- rather than one.

In addition to providing this potential for equalized child care, a truly egalitarian marriage embraces a more general division of labor which satisfies what we like to call "the roommate test." That is, the labor is divided just as it is when two men or two women room together in college or set up a bachelor apartment together. Errands and domestic chores are assigned by preference, agreement, flipping a coin, alternated, given to hired help, or -- perhaps most often the case -- left undone.

It is significant that today's young people, so many of whom live precisely this way prior to marriage, find this kind of arrangement within marriage so foreign to their thinking. Consider an analogy. Suppose that a white male college student decided to room or set up a bachelor apartment with a black male friend. Surely the typical white student would not blithely assume that his black roommate was to handle all the domestic chores. Nor would his conscience allow him to do so even in the unlikely event that his roommate would say: "No, that's okay. I like doing housework. I'd be happy to do it." We suspect that the typical white student would still not be comfortable if he took advantage of this offer because he and America have finally realized that he would be taking advantage of the fact that such a roommate had been socialized by our society to be "happy" with such obvious inequity. But change this hypothetical black roommate to a female marriage partner, and somehow the student's conscience goes to sleep. At most it is quickly tranquilized by the comforting thought that "she is happiest when she is ironing for her loved one." Such is the power of an unconscious ideology.

Of course, it may well be that she _is_ happiest when she is ironing for her loved one.

Such, indeed, is the power of an unconscious ideology.

REFERENCES

Bird, C. Born female: the high cost of keeping women down. New York: Pocket Books, 1969.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Dodge, N.D. Women in the Soviet economy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Fisher, E. The second sex, junior division. The New York Times Book Review, May, 1970.

Gallup, G., & Hill, E. The American woman. The Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 22, 1962, pp. 15-32.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? Transaction, April, 1968, 5, 28-30.

Goldberg, S., & Lewis, M. Play behavior in the year-old infant: early sex differences. Child Development, 1969, 40, 21-31.

Horner, M.S. Fail: bright women. Psychology Today, November, 1969.

Maccoby, E.E. Effects upon children on their mothers outside employment. In Work in the lives of married women. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Milton, G.A. Sex differences in problem solving as a function of role appropriateness of the problem content. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 705-708.

Nye, F.I., & Hoffman, L.W. The employed mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Ringo, M. The well-placed wife. Unpublished manuscript, John Paisios & Associates, 332 South Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois. 60604.

Spock, B. Should mothers work? Ladies' Home Journal, February, 1963.

Terman, L.M., & Oden, M.H. Genetic studies of genius, V. The gifted group at mid-life: Thirty-five years' follow-up of the superior child. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1950.

Thoman, E.B., Leiderman, P.H., & Olson, J.P. Neonate-mother interaction during breast feeding. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 110-118.

U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Fact sheet on the earnings gap, February, 1970.

REFERENCES (cont'd)

U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Handbook on women workers, 1969, Bulletin 294.

Yarrow, M.R., Scott, P., de Leeuw, L., & Heinig, D. Child-rearing in families of working and non-working mothers. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 122-140.